40312

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada | **CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE** | ***THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE***

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* CHRISTOPHER JOHN SIMPSON

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* SIX STUDIES IN EARLY ROMAN IMPERIAL HISTORY

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* PHD

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1978

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* R.C. Smith

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* 28 September 1978 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ*

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ*
P.O. Box 569 Sub. 11
UNIVERSITY of ALBERTA
Edmonton ALTA T6G 2E0

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (3/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SIX STUDIES
IN
EARLY ROMAN IMPERIAL HISTORY

by

© C.J. SIMPSON

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
CLASSICS

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Six Studies in Early Roman Imperial History," submitted by Christopher John Simpson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics.

Richard E. Smith

Supervisor

Robert J. Buck

U. Trumpener

S.M. Treggiari

External Examiner

Date September 22, 1978

TO MY FATHER AND MOTHER

ABSTRACT

This thesis contains six studies of historical topics in the reigns of the first three Roman emperors Augustus, Tiberius, and Gaius.

In the first study it is suggested that the future emperor Claudius was born on the very day that the altar "Romae et Augusto" was dedicated at Lyon, that is, 1 August 10 B.C.

The second study examines the evidence for the date of dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus in 2 B.C., and the suggestion is made that the temple was dedicated on 12 May and not, as scholars currently believe, on 1 August. The existence of an aedicula dedicated on the Capitol to Mars Ultor in 20-19 B.C. is also disputed.

The third study is divided into two parts. In the first part it is suggested that the change in praenomen of the elder Drusus took place in 24 B.C. because at that time the elder Drusus wished to associate himself more closely with his brother, the future emperor Tiberius. In the second part it is discovered that Claudius received the

honorific cognomen Germanicus when it was given in 9 B.C. to his dead father, the elder Drusus, and his brother. When Claudius' brother entered the Julian house in A.D. 4 as the adoptive son of the future emperor Tiberius, Claudius discarded his current cognomen Drusus and assumed his elder brother's familial cognomen Nero.

The fourth study is concerned with the changes in electoral procedure adopted at Rome in A.D. 14 by Tiberius. It is suggested that the Tacitean statement (Ann. 1. 15) "tum primum comitia e campo ad patres translata sunt" refers to a process in which the names of "destined" candidates for the praetorship of A.D. 15 were read out for approval in the Senate and not before the centuriate assembly.

In the fifth study there is a detailed examination of the sources for the alleged conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus against the emperor Gaius in A.D. 39. There is found to be no support for the widely held belief that a plot was formed before Gaius travelled north in the fall of A.D. 39. It is suggested, rather, that Lepidus was executed as a result of adultery with the emperor's sisters, and that Gaetulicus was removed because of his incompetence in managing the affairs of his frontier province.

The final study in this thesis is concerned with the alleged aspirations to divinity of the emperor Gaius. It is suggested that the charges of impiety laid against Gaius by our ancient sources stemmed not so much from an attempted identification with Iuppiter but from his apparent rivalry with that god. Moreover, it is suggested that there was only one temple associated with a cult of Gaius at Rome in A.D. 40, and that it was established not to worship Gaius as a god but to honor his "*numen*."

PREFACE

Over three years ago I embarked upon the writing of a historical commentary to Suetonius' life of the emperor Claudius. Such a commentary had not been attempted since the appearance in 1896 of H. Smilda's invaluable work (C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii, Diss. Groningen) and seemed to be a well defined and most worthwhile dissertation topic. Very soon, however, it became apparent that such a commentary could only be completed in the relatively short period allowed to students attempting doctoral dissertations by ignoring many problems of minor or major consequence, and by concentrating merely on problems better known or more likely to raise scholarly excitement. Had I set for myself some arbitrary editorial limits that defined either the scope or the depth of my inquiries, I might have been able to accomplish my task in a reasonable space of time. I viewed my function, however, in a different light: to pay equal and full attention to each historical problem as it arose.

My efforts to provide a useful commentary to Suetonius' biography continued. Nevertheless, I became increasingly side-tracked from the original aim of my endeavor. Whenever I lit upon a historical topic, no matter how inconsequential it seemed, I was compelled to search ever more painfully into its context and the treatment it had received at the hands of other scholars. More often than not, I found something that did not please me or something that did not appear to be quite consistent with the extant evidence. In sum, every historical topic became a historical problem.

Eventually, after two years of attempting a detailed and exhaustive commentary to Suetonius' biography of the emperor Claudius and researching every problem in depth with results not always proportionate to the time expended, I arrived at the end of chapter 9 in that biography. Thus, I appealed to the supervisory committee to allow me to change my dissertation topic to the present one. The topics to be discussed in this dissertation, therefore, all arose from a consideration of problems encountered initially in a detailed review of C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii, 1 - 9.

May, 1978 C.J. Simpson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must here record the very great debt of gratitude I have incurred to all those who have encouraged and supported my work. Although it may be invidious to single out the names of individuals who have helped me, I must state that Dr. D. Fishwick of the University of Alberta was a constant source of encouragement and inspiration during the earlier stages of dissertation writing. After Dr. Fishwick had left the University on sabbatical leave, I was fortunate to receive direction from Dr. R.C. Smith, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Classics. To Dr. Smith and to the other members of the supervisory committee, Dr. R.J. Buck and Dr. A.M. Small, I owe much and cannot express adequately here my debt to them. Finally, I wish to thank my wife Ruth, whose enthusiasm for my work has always sustained me. As many others before me have found, it is the family of the student that bears the greatest burden and not the student himself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

Introduction 1

1 The Birth of Claudius and the Date of Dedication of the Altar "Romae et Augusto" at Lyon 8

2 The Date of Dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor 22

3 Problems of Nomenclature 33

  I The Change in Praenomen of the Elder Drusus 35

  II The Early Name of the Emperor Claudius 41

4 Tacitus and the Praetorian Elections of A.D. 14 53

5 The "Conspiracy" of A.D. 39 75

6 The Cult of the Emperor Gaius 112

Summary 151

****

NOTES 156

ABBREVIATIONS 264

BIBLIOGRAPHY 269

APPENDIX. The Early Name of Germanicus 291

VITA 297

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation contains the substance of several articles and papers prepared for publication in learned journals or for delivery at conferences and seminars. They are all concerned to a greater or lesser degree with the public or private acts of the first three Roman emperors, Augustus, Tiberius, and Gaius. The topics to be discussed in the pages that follow are diverse and, essentially, have little in common with each other except that they deal, by and large, with themes significant in the history of the early empire; with politics, religion, and conspiracy. More importantly, however, I believe that it will become evident on reading this dissertation how small the mass of assured knowledge is for the activities of the earlier Julio-Claudian emperors, and how almost every aspect of these activities is open to re-interpretation and re-evaluation.

Most of the topics to be treated here--perhaps with the exception of the arrangements for the praetorian elections in A.D. 14 and the cult of the emperor Gaius at Rome in A.D. 40--have long been considered as no longer worthy of detailed review. Many historians, judging from the lack discussion of these topics in their published works, appear to believe that such topics do not now constitute major problems. Rather, they seem to accept the solutions proposed by other scholars from the late nineteenth century on and now employ these solutions as historical data on which to base their own research.

For example, in Chapter 5 (the chapters have been arranged according to the chronological order of the events with which they are chiefly concerned), we are confronted with the "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" (Suet. Claud. 9. 1) of A.D. 39. The reality of this conspiracy against Gaius has been accepted for many years. Moreover, it has been accepted as historical fact that the plot antedated the rapid journey across the Alps made by Gaius in the fall of A.D. 39, which, it is believed, was undertaken to suppress the conspiracy. Having accepted these assumptions, then, almost all scholars who have concerned themselves with these events in recent years have concentrated their efforts in explanatory or prosopographical research in order to uncover the motives of the conspirators and the identities of their alleged colleagues. Such an approach, however, is misguided; for, prior to embarking on a search for motives or for more conspirators, it is surely necessary to re-evaluate the ancient sources for the conspiracy. The obligation is first to discover whether or not we have any grounds for believing that the "conspiracy" was under way before Gaius travelled to Germany and whether or not it was designed primarily to oust Gaius from imperial power. The answers to such basic questions could well have a telling effect on the value of the explanatory or prosopographical researches of other scholars.

Another example of the problems to be encountered on assuming too many of the results of previous scholarship is given in Chapter 6, "The Cult of Gaius." It is suggested by many scholars that Gaius identified himself with Iuppiter. Such a suggestion, however, while plausible enough in itself, may have major ramifications for our interpretation of Gaius' reign. Also, the ever present notion that in A.D. 40 Gaius was the recipient of not one but two temples associated with the cult of himself in the persona of Iuppiter, or as an independent god of equal stature, can significantly alter our understanding of the man and the degree to which he may have attempted to gratify his aspirations to divinity. More importantly, perhaps, assumptions made about Gaius' activities have now been used to support the proposition that Gaius Julius Caesar also aimed at (and received) divine honors during his lifetime.

Problems such as these are made worse by the fact that, in several instances, our ancient sources do not agree among themselves or are inconsistent with evidence supplied through epigraphic or archaeological studies. In Chapter 2, "The Date of Dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor," the problem was relatively straightforward. Scholars, having assumed the validity of Dio Cassius' statement that the temple in the Forum of Augustus was dedicated on 1 August 2 B.C. (60. 5. 3), have been reduced to accepting the proposition that Ovid who placed this dedication on 12 May (Fasti 5. 545-598) was incorrect; even though he may well have been in Rome at the time of the temple's dedication. Such scholars have also accepted the existence of a small *aedicula* on the Capitol dedicated to Mars Ultor *circa* 19 B.C. after the return of the legionary standards from Parthia. It is stated that the *Ludi Martiales* recorded in certain ancient calendars for 12 May are to be associated with this earlier dedication--a belief that makes nonsense of Augustus' statement that, in his thirteenth consulship, he was the first to produce these Circensian games at Rome (*Res Gestae* 22. 2). The assumptions of scholars based on the incongruity of our sources, then, have a direct bearing on our appreciation of these sources and their historical validity.

Similar problems of incongruity also gave rise to the studies contained in the remaining chapters of this dissertation. In Chapter 1 which is concerned with the date of dedication of the altar "Romae et Augusto" at Lyon and the birth of the future emperor Claudius, we find that several scholars have simply rejected one source (in this case Suetonius, Claud. 2. 1) out of preference for another (Livy, Per. 139). In Chapter 3, "Problems of Nomenclature," we find the opposite to be true: what Suetonius is thought to have meant (Claud. 2. 1) is used to attack the validity of Dio (55. 2. 3). Again, in Chapter 4, "Tacitus and the Praetorian Elections of A.D. 14," epigraphic evidence allegedly belies the statement (Tacitus Ann. 1. 15) that in A.D. 14 Tiberius first transferred the "comitia" "e campo ... ad patres"; even though this transfer appears validated by Dio (59. 9. 6, 20. 4).

The single most important principle, then, on which my research has been based--and continues to be based--is simply this: that, at every turn, each source for a particular event or action must be re-examined ab initio. As many other scholars have discovered, it is not enough to accept the solutions proposed by far greater minds without a careful appeal to the ancient sources themselves.

To find that one source, Dio for example, is probably more reliable in one instance than Suetonius is not to find that Dio is invariably more reliable than the biographer. Also, to be aware of the many contributions made by Mommsen, his successors, and more recent historians should not lead us to an acceptance of the substance of these contributions without a most careful examination of the assumptions present in each scholar's work. To accept such assumptions without appraisal would be to do an injustice to those very scholars whom we would praise. The principle is as simple as it is well known. It was, however, an attempt to apply that principle rigorously that was chiefly responsible for the form of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 1

The Birth of Claudius and the Date of Dedication of the Altar "*Romae et Augusto*" at Lyon

In this first chapter we are, I believe, given ample evidence for one of the very problems to which I referred in the introduction to this dissertation. The problem is this: on occasion modern scholars appear to have rejected the testimony of Suetonius, believing either that the biographer has erred or that he intended a meaning far different from that which appears at first in the passage with which they are concerned. In support of either belief these scholars invariably adduce other pieces of evidence for which, in my opinion, there is often no *prima facie* case to uphold their authority or preferability. [1]

In Suetonius' biography of the emperor Claudius we are told that "*Claudius natus est Iullo Antonio Fabio Africano conss. Kal. Aug. Lugduni eo ipso* die quo primum ara ibi Augusto dedicata est" (Claud. 2. 1), that is, that Claudius was born in the consulate of Iullus Antonius and A. Fabius Maximus at Lyon on 1 August, the very day in which the altar there to Augustus was first dedicated.[2] Nothing could be clearer than the language employed by Suetonius. Iullus Antonius and Fabius Maximus, as we know from other sources, were consuls in 10 B.C.[3] Claudius, therefore, was born on 1 August 10 B.C. at Lyon. Both this date and the place of birth are well attested, not merely by Suetonius elsewhere in his work, but also by Seneca, Dio, and by epigraphic evidence.[4] Furthermore, on a first reading of the passage of Suetonius now under discussion, it certainly appears as if the biographer wished to document his own case for this date by supplying a clear context in which the birth of Claudius might be placed: "eo ipso die quo primum ara ... dedicata est."

What is contested in this passage, however, is the statement--according to the most straightforward interpretation--that makes Claudius' birth take place on the same day that the very famous altar "Romae et Augusto" was dedicated at Lyon. [5] Livy, in the summary of his work (Per. 139), clearly places the dedication of this altar in 12 B.C., after the riots occasioned by the census of the previous year had been suppressed. [6] The same scholars, then, who accept Livy's chronology, are also those who reject Suetonius' evidence. In their appreciation of the biographer's text, they may be classified into three separate groups according to the interpretations they espouse. Some scholars suggest that Suetonius has simply assigned the dedication of the altar "Romae et Augusto" to the wrong year. [7] Others believe that Suetonius, in fact, is referring not to the actual day of dedication of the altar but to the anniversary of that event. [8] Still others believe--or seem to imply--that the altar mentioned here is not to be identified with the monumental altar at Lyon but with some other altar that was dedicated to Augustus at Lyon on 1 August 10 B.C. [9]

The last suggestion, which is implicit in the translations of Rolfe and Ailloud for example, may be dismissed quickly enough. Why should Suetonius refer not to the well known altar at Lyon but to an obscure altar which is not mentioned in any other of our sources ? [10] After all, at no other point in his work does the biographer place the birth of the emperors in insignificant or obscure chronological contexts. Suetonius, rather, mentions notable events that were roughly contemporaneous with these births, or he omits completely any mention of a chronological mise en scene.

For example, the biographer tells us that Augustus was born in 63 B.C. on the very day that the Catilinarian plot was being discussed by the Senate (Aug. 94. 5), that Tiberius was born "per bellum Philippense" (Tib. 5), that Nero reached the light nine months after the death of Tiberius (Nero 6. 1), that Vespasian was born five years before the death of Augustus (Vesp. 2. 1), and that Titus "natus est III. Kal. Ian. insigni anno Gaiana nece" (Titus 1). In the other biographies (Gaius, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Domitian) no such chronological contexts are given. [11] Thus, inasmuch as Suetonius only seems to supply such chronological information when that information is significant in itself and undoubtedly well known to his audience, we may presume that here too (*Claud*. 2. 1) the context in which he places the birth of Claudius would also have been well known. It is unlikely, then, that the biographer intended to refer to an altar less famous than the monumental altar dedicated "*Romae et Augusto*" at Lyon.

The second argument against Suetonius' chronological accuracy also appears to fail, and on similar grounds of misinterpretation. This argument, advanced by Holmes among others, is that Suetonius in his statement "*eo ipso die quo primum ara ... dedicata est*" has referred merely to the anniversary of the dedication of the altar at Lyon and not to the actual day and year of dedication.[12] At first glance, this argument appears to have some merit, for it reconciles our sources Suetonius and Livy and also exculpates the biographer from charges of chronological error. It is, however, quite unconvincing.

Firstly, whenever the biographer does place the birth of an emperor in a chronological context, he is invariably precise in his reference either to the contemporaneity of the events he describes (Augustus, Tiberius, Titus) or to the lapse of time between these events (Nero, Vespasian).[13] There is no reason to suppose that he broke with this practise here in his description of the birth of Claudius. Secondly, Suetonius employs the word "primum" in a context that can only be taken to emphasize the contemporaneity of the birth of Claudius and the dedication of the altar: "eo ipso die quo primum ..." Thirdly, had Suetonius intended the reader to believe that he referred to the anniversary of the dedication and not the day of dedication itself, why did he maintain a contemporaneity of verbal tense : "natus est ... dedicata est" ? In another, similar passage the biographer changed tenses precisely because he wished to indicate the fact that one event took place on the anniversary of an earlier event: (Nero 40. 4) "Neapoli de motu Galliarum [Nero] cognovit die ipso quo matrem occiderat." Clearly, Suetonius' grammatical contruction of this sentence from his life of Nero is virtually identical to his construction of the sentence in the biography of Claudius. I suggest, therefore, that Suetonius, had he wished to point out that Claudius was born on the anniversary of the dedication of the altar at Lyon, would, as in Nero 40. 4, have employed a pluperfect tense: "dedicata erat". To my mind the second argument is invalid.

The first argument against Suetonius' chronological accuracy remains. It is alleged that the biographer has placed the dedication of the altar "Romae et Augusto" in 10 B.C. when it was actually dedicated some two years earlier in 12 B.C.

This argument, however, relies for its support solely on the evidence supplied by Livy's epitomator: (Per. 139) "Civitates Germaniae cis Rhenum et trans Rhenum positae oppugnantur a Druso, et tumultus, qui ob censum exortus in Gallia erat, componitur; ara dei Caesaris ad confluentem Araris et Rhodani dedicata, sacerdote creato C. Iulio Vercondaridubno Aeduo." 14 This event, according to Livy, took place in 12 B.C. Livy's date also has some support in the account of Cassius Dio (54. 32. 1) where it is stated that the elder Drusus seized subject territory in 12 B.C. and summoned native leaders to Lyon on the pretext of taking part in the festival "ἣν καὶ νῦν περὶ τὸν τοῦ 'Αυγούστου βωμὸν ἐν Λουγδούνῳ τελοῦσι...."[15] It should be noted, however, that Dio does not mention either the erection or dedication of an altar "*Romae et Augusto*" in 12 B.C., but states merely that the native leaders were summoned to participate in a festival which, at the time of writing his account, was still being celebrated ("καὶ νῦν"). Livy and Dio, then, supply a date of 12 B.C. for the establishment of a festival at Lyon, but only Livy's account gives the year 12 B.C. for the dedication of the altar itself.

Now, in an attempt to reconcile our differing sources, the suggestion has been made that there was at Lyon in pre-Roman times a native Gallic festival to which Augustus at a later date grafted the rites of the new cult of Rome and Augustus, and that it is to this pre-existing festival that Dio refers.[16] This suggestion has merit but it is not totally convincing. Not only is the existence of a religious festival at Lyon in pre-Roman times far from certain, especially in view of Dio's statement that Drusus summoned the native leaders, but also to follow the suggestion that Dio is referring to such a festival--a suggestion implicit in Wells--would oblige us to accept the improbable inference that the elder Drusus intimately associated himself in 12 B.C. with a native festival that had no inherent relevance to Roman interests in Gaul.[17] This cannot be accurate, for it is implicit in the accounts of Livy and Dio that a festival was established at Lyon in 12 B.C. and that, from the start, it was held under Roman auspices. Indeed, the appointment of a romanized Aeduan, C. Iulius Vercondaridubnus, as the first "sacerdos" of the new cult must stand as evidence for the Roman nature of the festival and for its value in propagandizing the benefits of Roman rule through a medium that was politically acceptable to the native inhabitants of Gaul.[18]

The difference in dates given by our ancient sources for the dedication of the altar still remains to be explained. Either Suetonius has erred in his statement that Claudius was born "eo ipso die quo primum ara ... dedicata est," or Livy (that is, his epitomator) has confused the date of the establishment of the new cult with that of the altar's dedication--an event that can only have taken place after construction of the altar had been completed. [19]

Now, if it is accepted--as I think it must be--that Livy and Dio are both concerned with the actual establishment of the new cult by the elder Drusus (who was probably acting on instructions received from Augustus as Pontifex Maximus in this year and not on his own initiative, as Guiraud and Gardthausen would have us believe [20]), and that Vercondaridubnus was the first priest of the new cult, it is also apparent that the operations of the future council of the Three Gauls were first initiated at the time of the establishment of the cult, that is, at the time of the "constitution" of the altar rather than at the time of the altar's dedication. [21] Indeed, there is nothing in Dio's account that necessarily suggests he is referring to a festival associated with the dedication of the monumental altar rather than its "constitution". Moreover, there are some grounds for believing that the "constitution" (that is, the formal establishment) of such an altar was an event of as high if not higher significance than the fact of its dedication, and that "constitution" itself was attended by a religious festival or ceremony. This was undoubtedly the case when the altar "Fortunae Reduci" was "constituted" by a formal decree of the Senate in 19 B.C.[22] Furthermore, it should be acknowledged that the date of the first assembly of Gallic leaders at Lyon probably marked the effective "dies natalis" of the later council, with the result that this date, more likely to be coincidental with the date of "constitution" of the altar which was the focus of the later council than the date of dedication, would probably have been more significant in political terms than the date of the altar's dedication.

It is conceivable, then, that Livy, his sources or his epitomator, has confused the date of the first establishment of the new cult at Lyon with that of the altar's dedication. There are two arguments in support of this contention. Firstly, the summaries of Livy's work at this point are full of chronological errors: the date of Agrippa's death in Per. 138, the return of the legionary standards from Parthia in Per. 141, and the date of the "clades Varianae" in Per. 142. One should not, therefore, accuse Suetonius of chronological inaccuracy without being aware that Livy--in this case, probably his epitomator, given the significance of the events in Per. 138, 141, and 142--was also susceptible to such errors.[23]

Secondly, in A.D. 41 Claudius caused to be issued at the mint of Lyon coins bearing a representation of the monumental altar and the legend ROM ET AVG.[24] Undoubtedly, this issue was made in celebration of Claudius' fiftieth birthday which occurred on 1 August A.D. 41 and which was feted at Rome by a presentation of Ludi Martiales.[25] That Claudius was born at Lyon was surely not a matter of great significance and hardly worth emphasizing by a representation of the altar at Lyon. That Claudius was born, as has been suggested, on the anniversary of the dedication of the altar "Romae et Augusto" was surely not of any greater significance than the fact that he was born also on the anniversary of the reduction of Alexandria in 30 B.C. On the other hand, should Claudius' birth have taken place at Lyon on the very day that the altar there was dedicated, as Suetonius clearly states, we may see that the issue of coins bearing the legend ROM ET AVG may well have had great significance for contemporaries of Claudius, even though this significance in terms of propaganda is hard to assess today.

To sum up: Suetonius tells us that Claudius was born at Lyon "eo ipso die quo primum ara ibi Augusto dedicata est." A majority of modern scholars, however, reject this statement on grounds of chronological inaccuracy and--without stating why--prefer Livy's account. Other scholars have attempted to reconcile these two sources, invariably, in my opinion, by misinterpreting Suetonius' text.

Neither course of action is valid. Given the fact that Livy's notice of the dedication of the altar at Lyon is surrounded by summaries that contain several chronological errors, it is probable that Livy's account here is also confused. We have, on the other hand, a clear context in which to place Livy's record and the festival mentioned by Dio (54. 32. 1): the importance attached at this time to the "constitution" of altars. In addition, as Mattingly, Grant, and Robertson among others have observed, there is the clear possibility that the coins issued in A.D. 41 bearing the legend ROM ET AVG were issued precisely because of the fact that the fiftieth birthday of Claudius also marked the fiftieth anniversary of the dedication of the altar "Romae et Augusto".[26] I submit, therefore, that Suetonius was not guilty of chronological inaccuracy when he stated that Claudius was born on the very day that the altar was dedicated at Lyon and that there is no cogent or compelling reason to reject his evidence in preference to that of Livy or his epitomator.

CHAPTER 2

The Date of Dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor *

For many years now scholars have considered the date of dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus as a matter beyond dispute. This date, 1 August 2 B.C., is based principally on the evidence supplied by Augustus, Velleius Paterculus, and Dio, and has been accepted as an established historical fact at least from the time of Th. Mommsen's discussion in 1893. [1] Nevertheless, certain problems arise from an acceptance of this date; problems, that is, which have a direct bearing on the use of the *Res Gestae* of Augustus and the *Fasti* of Ovid as valid historical sources.

The year in which the temple was dedicated in the Forum of Augustus has been established beyond all doubt. Velleius Paterculus (2. 100. 2) states that the temple was dedicated during the consulship of Augustus and L. Caninius Gallus, who, as we know from other sources, was suffect consul in 2 B.C. [2] Also Augustus assigns to this year--his thirteenth consulship--the first celebration of Ludi Martiales at Rome. [3] Furthermore, it may be accepted that Ludi Martiales were produced in subsequent years on the anniversary of the dedication of this temple. [4]

Unfortunately, however, there is a problem of chronology associated with the first production of these Circensian games at Rome. According to Dio's account of the early years of Claudius' reign (60. 5. 3), Ludi Martiales were produced on 1 August A.D. 41 and commemorated the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus. [5] According to the evidence of certain ancient calendars, on the other hand, (the Feriale Cumanum, the Fasti Maffeiani, Philocalus, the Feriale Duranum), such games were produced on 12 May. [6] Also Ovid, most likely an eyewitness to the events of 2 B.C., gives this earlier date, that is, 12 May, not only as the date for the celebration of these Circensian games but also for the dedication of the temple itself. In that section of the Fasti which deals with the events of 12 May (Fasti 5. 545-598), the poet mentions clearly and without any sense of ambiguity the dedication of the temple in the Forum of Augustus (5. 550-568), its raison d'être (5. 569-596), and the games which occurred at the time of the temple's dedication (5. 597-598).[7] Thus, if all the games referred to in our ancient sources are to be associated with the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in 2 B.C., it is at once apparent that we are presented with two mutually incompatible dates for that event, namely 1 August and 12 May.

In order to resolve this conflict, therefore, Mommsen proposed that the games which occurred on 12 May commemorated an earlier event; namely the dedication of a smaller temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitol which, according to Dio (54. 8. 3), was decreed by Augustus after the recovery of the lost legionary standards from Parthia in 20 B.C.[8] The existence of such an aedicula of Mars Ultor on the Capitol has been accepted as certain.

Coins exist, minted in Spain and at Ephesus *circa* 19-18 B.C., which bear on the reverse the representations of a small temple in which were placed *signa* and a small figure presumably of Mars, and the legend *MAR VLT*, or some such permutation of nomenclature. [9] The temples on these coins bear no resemblance to the grand edifice in the Forum of Augustus and, as a result, have been thought to commemorate the dedication *circa* 20 B.C. of a small temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitol. [10] The games, therefore, celebrated at Rome on 12 May are now thought to have commemorated the dedication of the *aedicula* on the Capitol, while those which were produced on 1 August presumably took place on the anniversary of the dedication of the temple in the Forum of Augustus.

Mommsen's solution is attractive and has been accepted by many historians. [11] Nevertheless, it seems to raise more problems than it solves. Firstly, Augustus' statement, "*[c]onsul XIII ludos / Mar[tia]les pr[imus fec]i, quos p[ost i]d tempus deinceps ins[equen]ti[bus] / annis [s.c. et lege fe]cerunt [co]n[su]les*" (*Res Gestae* 22. 2), can only be considered to be inaccurate, for, according to the standard belief, Ludi Martiales had been produced at Rome since 19-18 B.C. [12] Secondly, we must believe that Ovid was mistaken when he assigned the dedication of the temple in the Forum of Augustus to 12 May: "Mars venit et veniens bellica signa dedit. / Ultor ad ipse suos caelo descendit honores / templaque in Augusto conspicienda foro" (Fasti 5. 550-552). [13] Thirdly, while we must accept the existence of two temples dedicated to Mars Ultor at Rome and the celebration of two distinct Ludi Martiales, we must account for the complete lack of mention in the surviving Fasti of the Julio-Claudian era of both the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor on 1 August and the Ludi Martiales produced on that day--even though such games were evidently prescribed "s.c. et lege" (Res Gestae 22. 2). [14] Fourthly, we are required to believe that the earlier aedicula on the Capitol was intended primarily as a temporary resting place for the newly recovered signa until such time as the temple in the Forum of Augustus was ready for occupation. [15] And that is not all. If we accept Mommsen's suggestion, we must also explain why another contemporary poet, Horace, wrote in a poem whose *terminus post quem* is probably 13 B.C. that the standards were returned not to Mars but to Jupiter: "*et signa nostro restituit Iovi / derepta Parthorum superbis / postibus*" (*Car*. 4. 15. 6-8).[16] Even if, as some suppose[17], the standards were deposited in a temple of Jupiter on the Capitol until their "temporary" residence was ready, this cannot explain Horace's evident mistake only a few years after that *aedicula* must have been completed. Surely Horace had some knowledge of contemporary events ? Furthermore, if religious scruples allowed the deposition of the newly recovered standards in a temple of Jupiter *circa* 20 B.C., why should not these same scruples have permitted the *signa* to remain there until 2 B.C. ?

The problems raised by Mommsen's conjecture are now made obvious: Augustus, Ovid, and Horace are guilty of gross historical inaccuracy. But our only textual support for the existence of an *aedicula* dedicated to Mars Ultor on the Capitol is that which is supplied by Dio (54. 8. 3). Dio, it must be noted, does not state that the small temple on the Capitol was dedicated *circa* 19-18 B.C., but merely that Augustus "ψηφισθῆναι ἐκέλευσε."[18] Our only evidence, therefore, for the year in which such an *aedicula* was dedicated are the coins which were struck *circa* 19-18 B.C. and which bear the legend *MAR VLT*. But do these coins really commemorate the dedication of that temple on the Capitol ?

In 44 B.C. P. Sepullius Macer issued a coin on which there is a temple and the legend *CLEMENTIA CAESARIS*.[19] In the previous year, the Senate had decreed a temple to Caesar and to Clementia. Nevertheless, it is certain that the temple was never built.[20] In 36 B.C. Augustus caused to be issued coins showing a temple and bearing the legend *DIVO IVL*.[21] That temple was dedicated on 18 August 29 B.C.[22] In both these cases, therefore, it is apparent that the decision to build a temple is that which is commemorated and not the fact of the temple's dedication.

Furthermore, modern scholarship has supported the possibility that even as late as 19 B.C. the anniversary of the "constitution" of such a monument, that is, the formal decision to build, was of greater significance than that of the monument's dedication.[23] There is every likelihood, then, that the coins MAR VLT circa 19 B.C. commemorate the "constitution" of a temple of Mars Ultor and not the dedication of such a temple. Given the possibility, therefore, these coins may well be associated with a decision to build a temple of Mars Ultor not on the Capitol but in the Forum of Augustus--a temple, as we know from Macrobius Sat. 2. 4. 9, which took an unusually long time to complete.[24]

Mommsen's conjecture, therefore, rests solely on the unsupported testimony of Dio that a temple was to be erected on the Capitol to Mars Ultor in order to accommodate the newly recovered standards from Parthia. Given the weight of evidence, however, which is drawn from contemporary documentary sources, it now seems very likely that Dio confused the temporary resting place of the signa (that is, a temple of Jupiter on the Capitol), with the formal decision to build a temple of Mars Ultor in a new Forum Augustum in which these signa were eventually to be housed. [25]

If this suggestion is accepted, namely that Dio very probably misplaced the location of the new temple of Mars Ultor, it is at once apparent that we are still left with two conflicting dates for the dedication of that temple in 2 B.C. and for the first celebration of the Ludi Martiales at Rome, that is, 12 May (Ovid) and 1 August (Dio 60. 5. 3). Is it conceivable, then, that Dio has also confused (60. 5. 3) the production of Ludi Martiales with some other games that occurred on 1 August A.D 41 ?

Dio himself has supplied the answer. The historian states that Circensian games were produced on 1 August because that day was the anniversary of the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor and not because it was Claudius' birthday. Here, perhaps, the historian has been less than candid, for his purpose was to show how, at the beginning of his reign, Claudius moderated the extravagances of his predecessor. [26] Nevertheless, ever since the time of Augustus' death when it was decreed that games "ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς Ἀρείοις "should be produced on the anniversary of Augustus' birth (Dio 56. 46. 4), similar games had also occurred on the birthdays of other members of the imperial family. [27] From Dio's own account (60. 5. 1-2) it is apparent that Claudius followed this custom, which had been adopted also by his immediate predecessor Gaius. [28] Furthermore, not only may we assume that traditional offerings marked the anniversary of Claudius' birth [29], we are also told that the new emperor was particularly averse to the celebration of two different festivals on the same day. [30] Thus, given the indisputable fact that 1 August was Claudius' birthday, it is, surely, more probable than not that any production of Circensian games on that day early in Claudius' reign celebrated not the dedication of a temple some four decades earlier, but the anniversary of his birth. Dio's testimony (60. 5. 3) is clearly suspect and, at any rate, should not be preferred to the evidence supplied by the calendars and Ovid. Ovid, after all, was a contemporary of the events he described in Fasti 5. 545ff.

In short: On the evidence reviewed above, it is very probable that the first celebration of Ludi Martiales occurred in 2 B.C.--the year of Augustus' thirteenth consulship--on the occasion of the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus. The date of dedication was undoubtedly that which is supplied by Ovid, that is, 12 May. This proposition has the merit of removing from the Capitol a "temporary" temple of Mars Ultor, of reducing the number of Ludi Martiales produced at Rome prior to Augustus' death to only one a year--the number actually recorded in the calendars--and, most beneficial, of rehabilitating the contemporary accounts of Augustus, Horace, and Ovid.[31]

CHAPTER 3

Problems of Nomenclature

In the first two chapters of Suetonius' biography of the emperor Claudius there are two major problems of nomenclature. The first problem is concerned with the name given to Claudius' father, the elder Drusus, at the time of his birth and the subsequent change of his *praenomen* (from Decimus to Nero) at a later and unspecified date (*Claud*. 1. 1). The second problem is concerned with the change of *cognomen* by the future emperor Claudius in A.D. 4 which is recorded by the biographer in the following way: (*Claud*. 2 1) "*Claudius ... appellatusque Tiberius Claudius Drusus. mox fratre maiore in Iuliam familiam adoptato Germanici cognomen assumpsit*."

Certainly, these are significant problems; for they, in fact, yield further evidence of a phenomenon well known to historians of the late republic and early empire: the use of nomenclature almost as propaganda by families or individuals who wished to gain personal or political benefits --or who desired to keep such benefits having obtained them already--from a close and well advertised relationship with the dominant family at Rome. [1] The inverse to such an advertisement of family relationships may also be true. On occasion, individuals may have sought to hide their familial ties with persons who, for whatever reason, had achieved a certain notoriety at Rome, or may have attempted to make less apparent their own humble origins. [2]

In addition, it is possible that a change in nomenclature could occur for both of the reasons indicated above. Thus, a man might wish to make less obvious his relationship with one who had fallen into disfavor with the current régime. Such a man might, at the same time, wish to throw into sharper focus his links with the ruling élite or with someone who had gained distinction in the service of that élite. It will be apparent from the discussion that follows that the changes in name of Claudius' father and Claudius himself conform quite closely to the pattern of political or personal advantage I have just described.

Part I

The Change in Praenomen of the Elder Drusus

Suetonius, in his statement "patrem Claudi Caesaris, olim Decimum mox Neronem praenomine, ..." (Claud. 1. 1), is the only ancient authority for the original praenomen of Claudius' father, that is, Decimus. At some time in the elder Drusus' infancy, youth, or early manhood--the word "mox" is of no help at all--this praenomen was discarded in favor of that of Nero. When this change took place is not known.[3] Nevertheless, the two most likely occasions for the change may be considered to be the death of Drusus' father, Ti. Claudius Nero, and, equally probable--perhaps more so--the time of Drusus' assumption of the toga virilis.[4] Unfortunately, the date for neither event can be fixed with certainty. Even so, a defence can be made for the year 33 B.C. as that in which Ti. Claudius Nero died.

Suetonius tells us (Tib. 6. 4) that Tiberius, the future emperor and Drusus' brother, "novem natus annos defunctum patrem pro rostris laudavit." In other words, Drusus' brother was in his tenth year when his father died. According to certain ancient calendars, the Feriale Cumanum, the f. a. Antiates, the Acta Fratrum Arvalium, and again to Suetonius (Tib. 5. 1), the future emperor Tiberius was born on 16 November 42 B.C.[5] Thus, Tiberius' tenth year and the funeral laudation of his father probably took place in 33 B.C.

Also, the year in which the elder Drusus donned the toga virilis is not known. From a comparison, however, of the early and analogous careers of Drusus and his brother Tiberius, both of whom were allowed to hold public office five years prior to the legal minimum age[6], it may be suggested that the elder Drusus assumed the toga virilis at the same age as his brother, that is, in his fifteenth year.[7] This would place the elder Drusus' assumption of the toga virilis in 24 B.C.

Now, before an attempt is made to discover which of the two dates best fits Drusus' change of name, or, by a consideration of the events of those years, which offers us a more plausible motive for the change, it is necessary first to discover why Drusus' original praenomen was Decimus. From the time of Mommsen this problem has been largely ignored; for it has been accepted that the praenomen Decimus was a well used name appropriate to this particular branch of the Claudian gens.[8] There is, however, no real support for this assertion which has been followed by, among others, Münzer.[9] The only alleged example of the use of the praenomen Decimus by this branch of the Claudian family--apart, that is, from the example under discussion--is recorded in the early inscription CIL I 857.[10] It is, then, legitimate to attempt an explanation for Drusus' praenomen Decimus.

The answer to this problem, I believe, lies in the reasons that may be found for Drusus the Elder's cognomen, that is, according to Suetonius, Drusus. Now, Drusus was born in what can only be described as rather mysterious circumstances in the year 38 B.C., either three days before Octavian's marriage to his mother Livia or in the third month after the wedding ceremony on 17 January.[11] Which is the correct date remains to be determined. Nevertheless, what is obvious in either case--given that the child was born after Livia's divorce from its father, Ti. Claudius Nero (which, according to Dio 48. 34. 3 took place in 39 B.C.)--is that the fortunes of Drusus' father were at a particularly low ebb.[12] In such a situation, then, it is very probable that Drusus' parents thought it advantageous to lay less emphasis on the child's paternal lineage and, by the adoption of the *cognomen* Drusus, to stress the infant's maternal links with the Livian *gens*. (Though perhaps not relevant here, it should be remembered that Drusus' maternal grandfather was Appius Claudius Pulcher who after his adoption into the Livian family, became known as M. Livius Drusus Claudianus.[13])

Given such political or personal considerations, then, it is as likely as not that the *praenomen*

Decimus was chosen for the infant precisely because it was not a name well used by this branch of the Claudian family. Furthermore, the name Decimus seems to have been used only sparingly by the more prominent families of late republican Rome and, apart from its association with D. Iunius Brutus (*cos. des*. 42 B.C.), may well have been thought to have been politically neutral.[14] Certainly the name was not chosen because Drusus was the tenth child born to Ti. Claudius Nero or because he was born in the tenth month of the year.[15]

So much, then, for the choice of the *praenomen* Decimus. Why was there a change in nomenclature and when did this change occur ? Did this change occur in 33 B.C. when Drusus' father died or did it take place some nine years later in 24 B.C. (which is the most likely year for Drusus' assumption of the *toga virilis*) ? In 33 B.C., perhaps, the memory of Drusus' actual parentage recalled by the assumption of the name Nero could well have been considered as unfortunate. After all, only five years at the most would have passed since Octavian's marriage to Drusus' mother Livia. The year 24 B.C., on the other hand, appears to offer us a more plausible context for the change in name.

In 24 B.C. the elder Drusus' guardian Augustus had returned to Rome and, along with Marcellus, Drusus' brother Tiberius received his first extraordinary public honors.[16] If Drusus took up the *praenomen* Nero at this time, the change in nomenclature may perhaps have been thought to have underlined publicly the close relationship that existed beween himself and his brother. Tiberius, of course, also bore the name Nero and, if for no other reason than his accelerated rise to public office, had certainly gained the attention of the Roman people. Indeed, years later the power of the name Nero is well demonstrated by the court poet Horace, who wrote (*Car*. 4. 4 27-28) "*... quid Augusti paternus / in pueros animus Nerones*."[17]

Needless to say, this suggestion that Drusus' change of name occurred as the result of a need for a well advertised affiliation with his brother rests on very slender supports. At present, however, there appears to be no more plausible occasion for the change in nomenclature or more plausible motive first for the selection of the praenomen Decimus and, second, for the subsequent assumption of the praenomen Nero. Self interest, or, rather, the instinct for self advancement-- an instinct that, given the circumstances, could not have been fostered without the active approval of Augustus himself-- provides us, in my opinion, with a most reasonable situation in which to place the elder Drusus' change in nomenclature.

Part II

The Early Name of the Emperor Claudius

We may now turn to the second problem of nomenclature posed for us in the early chapters of Suetonius' biography of the emperor Claudius. The biographer, just as he was our only source for the original praenomen of the elder Drusus, is also our only ancient authority for the earlier *cognomen* of the future emperor. Suetonius states (*Claud*. 2. 1) that "*Claudius ... appellatusque Tiberius Claudius Drusus. mox fratre maiore in Iuliam familiam adoptato Germanici cognomen assumpsit*."[19]

Now, the standard interpretation of this passage is as follows: In A.D. 4 Augustus obliged the future emperor Tiberius to adopt his dead brother's elder son. Very soon thereafter, on 26 June, Tiberius was himself adopted by Augustus. Thus, the future emperor entered the Julian household. With him went his two sons, his own son Nero Claudius Drusus and his rather more recently acquired son whose name at this stage, immediately prior to Tiberius' adoption, is uncertain but was probably Tiberius Claudius Nero Germanicus, and who has been known since the earliest times as Germanicus.[20] At the time of these adoptions, then, Claudius discarded the *cognomen* Drusus and took up the *cognomina* of his elder brother Nero Germanicus.[21] Claudius then became known as Tiberius Claudius Nero Germanicus or by some similar permutation of names.[22] This standard interpretation of the Suetonian passage is based primarily on the scholarship of Mommsen who adduced a passage of Dio (*Frg*. 44) to support his suggestion that Claudius did not receive the honorific *cognomen* Germanicus at the time it was bestowed posthumously on his father in 9 B.C. At this time, however, according to Mommsen who kept his argument consistent with Dio *Frg*. 44, Drusus' elder son did receive the honorific *cognomen* Germanicus. At the time of the adoptions of A.D. 4, then, Claudius became the oldest surviving son of the elder Drusus and, as a result, assumed the title Germanicus.[23]

This interpretation, then, though based in part on the relevance of a fragment of Dio that refers not to an event in the last decade before Christ but to an event in 240 B.C., has been accepted by a great number of scholars, notably--for example--Momigliano, Scramuzza, Kraft, and Timpe.[24] It was not completely accepted, for example, by Frank, Groag, or by Kneissl.[25] Frank, on the basis of an epigraphic study that may only be described as highly selective, asserted that Claudius never actually assumed the cognomen Nero until his short suffect consulship of A.D. 37 and, further, that the major inscription in which that name occurs, that is, CIL V 6416--the so-called "Pavian" inscription of A.D. 7/8--was merely an anachronistic device employed by Claudius as he journeyed north in A.D. 39. According to Frank, Claudius, "eager as he always was for recognition by the imperial house, ... seized the opportunity of brief power during his journey northward in 39 to gratify his vanity by adding his own statue to those of the imperial family that had been recognised by Augustus in the year 7/8."[26]

Fortunately, Frank's suggestion, though commended to students of ancient history by Charlesworth[27], was speedily demolished by Gardthausen and Stuart, both of whom cite an inscription which, at the very latest, must have been engraved prior to Claudius' consulship in A.D. 37, which refers to Claudius and which bears the name Nero.[28] Frank, however, did not contest the suggestion that Claudius received the *cognomen* Germanicus at the time of the adoptions in A.D 4.

Groag's objection was much less momentous. He stated that "*als der Senat nach dem Tode seines Vaters (745 = 9 v. Chr.) diesem und seiner Nachkommenschaft den Beinamen* Germanicus *decretierte*, *(Suet. l. Dio LV 2 3 ...), bekam wohl auch C. diese Cognomen. Im J. 4 n. Chr. wurde jedoch sein* (Claudius) *älterer Bruder, der ursprünglich* Ti. Claudius Nero *geheissen haben dürfte, von Tiberius adoptiert und trat damit in das julische Geschlecht über; C. vertauschte nun sein cognomen* Drusus *mit dem seines Bruders*, Nero, *dem angestammten Beinamen dieses Zweiges der Claudier ....*" [29]

Kneissl, however, the author of the most recent and authoritative work on "*Siegestitulatur*", did not go so far. He, while recognizing the force of Mommsen's reliance on Dio *Frg*. 44 and accepting the argument that Claudius did not receive the honorific *cognomen* Germanicus until A.D. 4, nevertheless expressed doubt that in the first decade of our era there was a strong hereditary rule in such matters as surnames or honorific cognomina. Perhaps more significantly, Kneissl accepted the suggestion that Claudius became known as Ti. Claudius Nero Germanicus after the adoptions in A.D. 4, but did not explain how Claudius received the name Nero. This, perhaps, was a major lapse, for he asserts that Germanicus, prior to his adoption by Tiberius, was probably known as Nero Claudius Germanicus and thus, according to this nomenclature, did not possess any familial cognomen.[30]

Whatever the objections, therefore, to Mommsen's proposition that Claudius received the name Nero along with that of Germanicus in A.D. 4, it is the communis opinio of modern historians that Claudius did not possess the cognomen Germanicus until the adoptions of A.D. 4.

Now, the one major problem with Mommsen's interpretation of the Suetonian passage (Claud. 2. 1) is this very assumption. The proposition that Claudius did not receive the name Germanicus until 26 June A.D. 4 lies in direct conflict with Dio's assertion (55. 2. 3, see Groag, above p. 45), that in 9 B.C. Drusus received the title or honorific cognomen Germanicus along with his sons, "μετὰ τῶν παίδων." This conflict, attributed to our ancient sources rather than to the deficiencies of modern scholarship, led Momigliano to dismiss summarily Dio's statement as a confusion of the facts. Momigliano then proceed in what is itself a confused note to reject, more or less out of hand, the interpretation introduced by Groag (see above p.45).[31] Groag's suggestion, in fact, lent some credence to Dio 55. 2. 3 but, unfortunately, was supported by little detailed argument. Momigliano accepted the relevance of Dio Frg. 44 and preferred to see in Claudius' change in nomenclature "one of those deliberate returns to archaistic custom that were so frequent in the Augustan period."[32] Momigliano did not elaborate further.

In all this, however, it must be kept constantly in mind that the conflict in our ancient sources stems from an acceptance of Mommsen's interpretation of the sentence "Claudius ... Germanici cognomen assumpsit." The conflict has merely been attributed to our ancient sources, Suetonius and Dio, and may under careful examination be found to be imaginary.

It is possible, in fact, to re-vitalize Groag's suggestion that Dio was substantially correct and that in A.D. 4 Claudius received only the familial *cognomen* Nero. The *cognomen* which Germanicus probably possessed at the time of his transfer into the Julian household as the adoptive son of Tiberius was Nero. Thus, when Suetonius wrote that Claudius "*Germanici cognomen assumpsit*," the biographer may well have meant that Claudius assumed not the honorific *cognomen* Germanicus but Germanicus' familial name Nero. (It is noteworthy that Suetonius did not write "*cognomina*" but "*cognomen*.")

There is only one significant objection against this suggestion--apart, that is, from citing that passage of dubious relevance, Dio *Frg*. 44. In the preceding chapter of his biography of Claudius (*Claud*. 1. 3), Suetonius employed the same phrase "*Germanici cognomen*" in a context which can only yield the meaning "the *cognomen* Germanicus."[33] Against this objection, however, it may be stated that Suetonius, in such phrases as Claud. 1. 3, often made use of the Genitival Case, where other Latin authors would more probably have employed the Accusative or the Dative Case.[34] Thus, it is possible that, because of Suetonius' grammatical idiosyncrasy, a confusion has here arisen as to the correct interpretation of the sentence "Claudius ... Germanici cognomen assumpsit." There is, moreover, evidence to support this conjecture.

In an earlier biography Suetonius has given us in one sentence a graphic illustration of both usages under discussion here. Suetonius stated in his biography of the emperor Augustus (Aug. 7. 2) that Octavian "postea Gai Caesaris et deinde Augusti cognomen assumpsit." In other words, Octavian first took up the familial cognomen of his adoptive father Gaius Caesar and then, at a later date, assumed the honorific title Augustus. The cognomen Caesar, of course, was not at this time prior to the establishment of the Principate--or, indeed, until the accession of Claudius--an honorific title or necessary element in a quasi-imperial nomenclature. The name Caesar was assumed by Octavian precisely because it was his family name.[35]

From an examination of Aug. 7. 2, therefore, we may see that the correct interpretation of Claud. 1. 3 is not necessarily relevant to a correct understanding of the sentence under discussion here, Claud. 2. 1. In Claud. 2. 1 Suetonius, far from referring to the honorific cognomen Germanicus, may have meant merely that at the time of the adoptions in A.D. 4 Claudius assumed the familial name Nero. It is important to remember here that the biographer--like most modern historians--regularly made use of Claudius' elder brother's popular name Germanicus.[36]

Furthermore, there is nothing in the overall construction of the sentence, "fratre adoptato ... Germanici cognomen assumpsit," that tells against this proposition. Suetonius may certainly have constructed his sentence in order to lay a particular emphasis on the occasion which influenced Claudius' change in nomenclature. A sentence in which the subject of an Ablative Absolute recurs is not a grammatical oddity. In such sentences the Ablative Absolute puts into sharp relief the action reported in the Ablative Absolute.[37]

How Claudius received his nomenclature may therefore be reconstructed in the following way: Claudius was originally named Tiberius Claudius Drusus. In 9 B.C., on the death of their father, both he and his elder brother received the honorific *cognomen* Germanicus--Dio 55. 2. 3 far from being contradicted by *Claud*. 2. 1, is actually supported by *Claud*. 1. 3 "*senatus ... decrevit ... Germanici cognomen ipsi posterisque eius*." In A.D. 4 Claudius' elder brother and his uncle entered the Julian house, leaving that ancient branch of the Claudian family, the *Claudii Nerones*, without any member bearing its accustomed *cognomen*. It was in order to avoid such an occurrence that Claudius discarded the name Drusus and assumed the *cognomen* Nero.

In addition, there may have been another motive for the change in nomenclature at this time. Claudius, like his father, may have wished to emphasize the close links between himself and the members of his immediate family and the more favored members of the Claudian gens. At any rate, by A.D. 4, there could have been no doubt in the minds of the Roman public that the name Nero was to be associated with the rising stars in the Augustan firmament.[38]

The first two chapters of Suetonius' life of the emperor Claudius offer us two examples of changes in nomenclature that are not associated with accession to imperial power. In both these instances, should the interpretations advanced here be accepted,we may see a variety of motives at work. Of these motives perhaps the most influential were the desire to lay emphasis on family ties by the maintenance of the family name and the desire to assert publicly a close affiliation to those persons, who, at the time of change in nomenclature, had achieved a certain distinction in the service of the Augustan regime or who had become part of the ruling élite.

CHAPTER 4

Tacitus and the Praetorian Elections of A.D. 14

In recent years a number of scholars have concerned themselves with the problem of "*nominatio*" in the elections of the early empire and, in particular with Tacitus' well known statement that Tiberius, on his accession in A.D. 14, "*candidatos praeturae duodecim nominavit, numerum ab Augusto traditum; et hortante senatu ut augeret, iure iurando obstrinxit se non excessurum*" (*Ann*. 1. 14. 6). [1] By an examination of the way in which the verb "*nominare*" has been used elsewhere in the works of Tacitus and Pliny in contexts concerned with electoral procedure, such scholars have shown convincingly that the reigning emperor did not possess during the early principate a legally defined power of "*nominatio*" with respect to the consular or praetorian elections at Rome. [2] It has been demonstrated also that the use of the verb "*nominare*" in this passage of Tacitus' Annals does not imply a formal procedure by which Tiberius accepted and approved the "professiones" of aspiring candidates.[3]

In addition to the above, very strong arguments have been made in support of the belief that the opening sentence of the next Tacitean chapter (Ann. 15. 1), "tum primum e campo comitia ad patres translata sunt," belongs to the same chronological context as Ann. 1. 14. 6 and that it too refers "to the election of praetors for A.D. 15."[4] According to Levick, "there can be no doubt that these elections took place under the new dispensation."[5] Moreover, the view that Tacitus' statement later in this same chapter, "moderante Tiberio, ne plures quam quattuor candidatos commendaret sine repulsa et ambitu designandos," refers to the praetorian elections of A.D. 14 has gained wide credence.[6]

Now, in the interpretation of Ann. 1. 14. 6, there are two broad categories into which the opinions of most recent scholars may be fitted.[7] Firstly, there are those scholars who believe that the "numerum ab Augusto traditum" refers to a list of future praetors that was drawn up by Augustus before his death and retained in its entirety by Tiberius, with or without the consent of the Senate. [8] Secondly, there are those historians who would see Tiberius acting in collaboration with the Senate in the selection of candidates who were then elected by the Senate. In this latter case the number of candidates who were selected equalled the number of praetorships available [9], or Tiberius merely read out the names of the twelve candidates (including the "*candidati Caesaris*") who had received the greatest number of votes in the Senate, with the result that the Senate urged Tiberius ("*et hortante senatu*") to read out more names and by doing so increase the number of praetorships for A.D. 15. [10] Within these two broad groups there appears to be an almost endless possibility for variation. Nevertheless, both are in agreement with respect to one aspect of the praetorian elections in A.D. 14: it is accepted that the normal electoral machinery of the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* of A.D. 5 virtually had ceased to function effectively. [11]

In addition, there is a third and much smaller group of scholars who believe that the terms of the *Lex Valeria Cornelia*, as they have been elucidated by the *Tabula Hebana* (a "*rogatio*" in honor of Germanicus found at Magliano in 1947 [12]), continued to be observed during the earlier years of Tiberius' reign. [13] These scholars believe, therefore, that Tacitus was either confused or mistaken in his statement "*tum primum ....*" [14]

It is the major contention of this chapter that a belief in the continued use of the electoral procedure outlined in the *Tabula Hebana*, and particularly of "*destinatio*" for the higher magistracies, is not incompatible with Tacitus' assertion concerning the transfer of the "*comitia*" "*e campo ... ad patres*" at the beginning of Tiberius' rule. An attempt will be made to show that the judicial decuries of senators and equites established by the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* of A.D. 5 continued to perform their allotted function of "destination" in and after A.D. 14, and that, in reality, Tacitus in *Ann*. 1. 15 is referring to a stage in the electoral process after "destination" had been carried out, when the remaining centuries of the "comitia centuriata" cast their votes, ratifying or rejecting the candidates selected by the "destination" centuries.

Firstly, in any consideration of the praetorian elections of A.D. 14, a number of historical factors must be taken into account. These are factors that seem to have received only scant attention from scholars interested primarily in the problems of "nominatio" :

(1) There is no evidence (pace Levick) that Augustus was expected to die in August A.D. 14. The fact that Tiberius had to be recalled to Italy clearly implies the contrary.[15]

(2) The consular elections had been completed and the praetorian elections were already under way when Augustus died.[16]

(3) Tacitus' account (Ann. 1. 14-15) refers to the same meeting of the Senate (presumably 17 September[17]) at which Tiberius accepted the responsibilities of the principate. Until that meeting, according to our ancient sources, Tiberius' position with respect to the principate remained

uncertain. Even at the start of the meeting no senator knew for sure whether or not Tiberius would become "princeps" : "quo usque patieris, Caesar, non adesse caput rei publicae ?" (Ann. 1. 13. 4).[18]

To take the last point first: those scholars who would see Tiberius arranging the praetorian elections of A.D. 14 in concert with the Senate or, perhaps, with the "consilium principis," and thereby reducing to a mere formality the "destination" process of the Lex Valeria Cornelia, are obliged to explain the fact that no senator appears to have known what position Tiberius would adopt concerning the principate. In fact, if we accept Tiberius' evident reluctance as genuine and that his intentions were unclear prior to the meeting on 17 September, we are surely compelled to conclude that the Senate was not privy to any prior consultation with Tiberius on such weighty matters as the elections for the praetorship of A.D. 15 and the transfer of the "comitia" "e campo ... ad patres."[19] The Tacitean statement "et hortante senatu ...," clearly confirms this lack of prior consultation or collaboration; whether or not it refers to the "numerum ab Augusto traditum" in the sense of the number of praetorships available for A.D. 15 or in the sense of "nomina ab Augusto tradita," as Lacey has suggested. [20] Also, this consideration excludes the possibility that the opening sentence of Ann. 1. 15 refers to a time between the death of Augustus on 19 August and the meeting of the Senate on 17 September.

Furthermore, the process of electing the praetors for A.D. 15 was already under way when Augustus died, and we know that at least Velleius Paterculus and his brother had gained the approval of the aging emperor. [21] Velleius has also informed us that there was an "ordinatio comitiorum, quam manu sua scriptam divus Augustus reliquerat." [22] Now, whatever this statement really means [23], we have to consider the possibility of Tiberius radically altering the arrangements made by his adoptive father. I believe that such a possibility is remote. [24] Not only may we see Tiberius strongly refusing to alter the "numerum ab Augusto traditum," but we also have the explicit statement of Velleius, an actual participant in these elections, that Augustus' "*ordinatio comitiorum*" was the "*primum principalium eius* [Tiberius] *operum*." [25] Surely Velleius' evidence here is at least as reliable as that of Tacitus ?

We must now consider what the "*ordinatio comitiorum*" refers to. As I have already observed (above [1]), there is no evidence to indicate that Augustus was expected to die in August, A.D. 14. There is, then, no reason to agree with Levick's suggestion that Augustus "sensing that his end was near and wishing to make the first few months of Tiberius' reign as trouble free as he could, may have disappointed more men than usual when he drew up his list." [26] Levick appears convinced that Augustus drew up a list of twelve candidates for the twelve praetorships of A.D. 15 and that Tiberius retained this list which he read out in the Senate allowing no change to be made to it: "In the event, no real, i.e. contested, election took place in the Senate or anywhere else, for what Tiberius read out there was a list of twelve candidates for twelve places, and when he refused to add to it it was passed on as it was to the comitia centuriata for ratification." [27]

Nevertheless, if we assume that Augustus had no premonition of his imminent death--and that is what the evidence seems to imply--we have no valid grounds for supposing that the arrangements he made for the praetorian elections of A.D. 14 differed widely from his established practice. [28] Of course, in A.D. 14--as in A.D. 7--Augustus, for some reason unknown to us, may have felt obliged to "appoint" all the magistrates. [29] Also, Dio makes it quite clear to us that, from A.D. 8, Augustus posted a list of favored candidates. [30] There is no evidence, however, that the "ordinatio comitiorum" referred to by Velleius (2. 124. 3) contained a list of twelve names for the twelve praetorships of A.D. 15. [31] In any case, when such "appointment" occurred, as in A.D. 7, it is still probable that the formalities prescribed in the Lex Valeria Cornelia were observed.

Despite all this, however, it may be possible that the "ordinatio comitiorum" of Augustus did contain the names of some favoured "candidati Caesaris." It is more probable that the number twelve "numerum ab Augusto traditum" figured in these arrangements. Nevertheless, since we know that the process of electing men for the praetorships of A.D. 15 had already started before Augustus' death and that Augustus died at Nola, it is apparent that the electoral process was continuing during Augustus' absence. In that case, it is certainly possible that the "ordinatio comitiorum" was nothing more than a set of written instructions to the magistrates at Rome who were presiding over these elections.[32]

At this point the testimony of Velleius Paterculus may be seen to assume an even greater significance--if only because he was a successful candidate in the elections of A.D. 14. It has been suggested already that there is little reason to suspect that Tiberius disturbed the arrangements made by his adoptive father. Moreover, in my opinion, there is no prima facie case for assuming that this "ordinatio comitiorum" was vastly different from the arrangements of previous years following the promulgation of the Lex Valeria Cornelia in A.D. 5. In his perceptive article in 1963, Lacey argued convincingly against Syme's view that the provisions of this law were suspended in A.D. 14.[33] Also, Lacey pointed out that the Tabula Hebana casts into doubt the usual translation of Velleius' statement "proxime a nobilissimis ac sacerdotalibus viris destinari" (2. 124. 4). Lacey suggested that "proxime a" should not mean "next after" but "next, by ...."[34] Thus, after Velleius and his brother had gained the approval of the aging "princeps" (as "candidati Caesaris"), they were "destined" by men of a most noble and priestly rank; "a pompous periphrasis for the assembly described in tab. heb."[35] In addition to this argument, we know that the terms of the Lex Valeria Cornelia were still in existence in A.D. 19 and A.D. 23 when, on the occasions of the deaths of Germanicus and the younger Drusus, a further total of ten "destination" centuries of senators and equites were created in honor of the deceased. [36] Furthermore, it must be noted that the very terminology of the relevant passage of the *Tabula Hebana* confirms the continued existence of the "destination" centuries of Gaius and Lucius Caesar under the terms of the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* of A.D. 5: (*TH* 3) "*[utiq. ad X] / centur. Caesarum quae de cos. pr. destinandis suffragium ferre solent adiciantur V centur[iae ....*" [37] According to Clarke, "the verb *solent*, by its meaning and tense must imply the uninterrupted existence of the *destinatio* centuries of G. and L. Caesar; it cannot allow the theory that these centuries, suspended now for five years [that is, from A.D. 14 to A.D. 19], have just been revived for the provision of funeral honours for Germanicus in A.D. 19." [38]

There is, then, apart from our present understanding of Tacitus *Ann.* 1. 15. 1, no evidence whatsoever to support the proposition that in A.D. 14 the "destination" centuries of senators and equites ceased to perform their allotted function. Indeed, not only is it highly probable that the judicial decuries of the "centuriae Caesarum" performed their task of "destination" in A.D. 14 (as in the case of Velleius Paterculus and his brother), it is also most likely--given Tacitus' record of the moderation shown by Tiberius, "ne plures quam quattuor candidatos commendaret ..." (Ann. 1. 15. 2)--that they continued to function effectively as a pre-selective body during Tiberius' reign.[39]

Inasmuch as the judicial decuries of the "centuriae Caesarum" continued at least until A.D. 23 to carry out their functions "de consulibus praetoribusque destinandis," we are presented with two options: either we accept the suggestions of those scholars who believe that Tacitus has erred in his statement that at the time of Tiberius' accession the "comitia" were transferred "e campo ... ad patres" or we must find a new interpretation for the statement.[40] I have observed already that there are few grounds for supposing that the arrangements for the praetorian elections in A.D. 14 differed markedly from those of previous years. As the provisions of the Lex Valeria Cornelia had been in effect from A.D. 5, it is quite unlikely that Tacitus, as Tibiletti has suggested, would have considered the process of "destination" to be a remarkable innovation in electoral procedure at Rome. Furthermore, I cannot accept Tibiletti's proposition that the "patres" to whom Tacitus refers are to be identified with the judicial decuries of the "centuriae Caesarum" which were composed of both senators and equites.[41] The opening sentence of Annals 1. 15, in my opinion, can only be reconciled with the continued existence of the "destination" centuries if it can be shown that it refers to a stage in the electoral procedure after "destination" of suitable candidates had been effected.

At this stage in the electoral process it is generally agreed that the names of the pre-selected candidates were read out before the remaining centuries of the "comitia centuriata."[42] If these candidates were unopposed then the selection made by the "centuriae Caesarum" was formally ratified and the candidates were assured of holding office. Just as in the last years of the Roman republic when the remaining centuries of the "comitia centuriata" were apt to follow the lead of the "centuriae praerogativae," so, in the the years following A.D. 5, the selection of candidates made by the "destination" centuries was usually accepted.[43] Nevertheless, until A.D. 14 at least, the remaining centuries still possessed the theoretical right of refusing the selection made by the judicial centuries. In my opinion, it is exactly this stage in the electoral procedure to which Tacitus refers in Annals 1. 15. In A.D. 14, and probably in subsequent years of Tiberius' reign, candidates were "destined" in the normal way by the "centuriae Caesarum." The practice, however, of reading out the names of these candidates before the remaining centuries of the "comitia centuriata" for formal ratification was abandoned in favor of a similar process in the Senate. Thus, Tiberius "candidatos praeturae nominavit" in the Senate after the candidates had been destined according to the provisions of the

Lex Valeria Cornelia.

The virtues of such a suggestion are obvious. Even if, as some suppose, the "destination" centuries had ceased to function effectively in A.D. 14, we must still accept the fact that the due form of pre-selection was carried out. How else may we explain the establishment of such "destination" centuries of senators and equites to honor the memory of Germanicus in A.D. 19 and of Drusus in A.D. 23 ?

This suggestion, I believe, receives some support from Tacitus' statements in Ann. 1. 15. For candidates looking to high office, it was not their "destination" or "pre-selection" that marked their success but that subsequent stage in the electoral process when the remaining centuries of the centuriate assembly cast their votes ratifying the decision of the prerogative body.[44] In Tacitus' account there is an obvious contrast between the "*campus*" and the "*patres*". In my opinion, the word "*campus*" in this phrase may only refer to the centuriate assembly gathered together in the Campus Martius for the purpose of electing the senior magistrates.[45] Thus, the right to approve the selection made by the "destination" centuries was removed from the people--"*neque populus ademptum ius questus est nisi inani rumore ....*"[46]

There is, however, only slight support from contemporary evidence for the suggestion made here--though, it must be stated, no less weighty than that which is adduced in support of the theories of other scholars. Firstly, until A.D. 14, after candidates had been selected by the destination centuries, they still had to present themselves before the assembled "*comitia centuriata*." The centuriate assembly--in theory if not in practice--had the right to cast votes in favor of, or in opposition to, these "destined" candidates. Undoubtedly, it was for this purpose that Augustus renovated the *Saepta* (the voting enclosures) in the Campus Martius.[47] At some point in Tiberius' reign, however, these marble enclosures were turned over to house displays of wild animals. It is clear, therefore, that the function of the *Saepta* had changed. Had the remaining centuries of the "*comitia centuriata*" still possessed the right to vote as an assembly in the annual elections of the higher magistrates, it is unlikely that the purpose of the Saepta would have been altered so drastically.[48] (It should be noted here that there is no evidence of the "*comitia centuriata*" exercising any judicial function in the Campus Martius during the principate and very little evidence for the enactment of legislation by the assembly after the reign of Augustus.[49])

Secondly, there is the evidence of the well known inscription *ILS* 944: "*...... viacure ..... [q. tr. p]l. pr. leg. [pro pr. imp. C]aesaris Augusti [i]ter. per commendation. Ti. Caesaris ab senatu cos. dest. patrono*."[50] This inscription has been cited by many scholars concerned with the problems of electoral procedure at Rome during Tiberius' reign.[51] Here, it is alleged, we are presented with an individual (name unknown[52]) who had been "destined" by the Senate after it had assumed the functions of the "destination" centuries, the "centuriae Caesarum." [53]

A candidate, however, according to all our modern authorities, was not formally elected to office by a prerogative body (whether the "centuriae Caesarum" or the Senate) but by the assembled "comitia centuriata." [54] Thus, if we accept the standard view, it is at once apparent that we are confronted here with a most unusual inscription: one that recorded not the unknown man's election to office but his success at an earlier stage in the electoral process, i.e. his "destination." There is, however, no parallel for an inscription of this type. Furthermore, the current interpretation of the statement "ab senatu cos. dest." is wholly incompatible with the suggestion made in this chapter that the "centuriae Caesarum" continued to exercise their function as a prerogative body during Tiberius' reign. [55]

There is, on the other hand, a second possible interpretation that may be applied to ILS 944 which, because it does not admit the element of anticipation of the election results that is inherent in the standard view, is surely more convincing. In the works of Livy, Pliny the Younger, and Suetonius the term "destination" or its cognates is used, on occasion, in place of the more normal term for a consul elected but not yet in his year of office, i.e. "designation." [56] Moreover, this use of the term "destinatus," though not common, is quite well known and, in fact, appears in another inscription dated to the first century after Christ: In CIL VI 932 Domitian is described as "consul destinatus II." The meaning is plainly that, in A.D. 72, Domitian became consul designate. Domitian, in fact, served as consul in A.D. 73. The term "destinatus" in CIL VI 932 is synonymous with the term "designatus." [57] I suggest, therefore, that the statement in ILS 944, "ab senatu cos. dest.," is not unique and that it does not anticipate the results of an election. Rather, like CIL VI 932, the inscription records the actual election of a man to the consulate.

If this suggestion is accepted, it becomes clear that the actual election of the unknown man that is recorded in ILS 944 did not occur as the result of voting in the Campus Martius by the assembled "comitia centuriata." Furthermore, if it is accepted also that the "centuriae Caesarum" continued to function as a prerogative body during Tiberius' reign, it is apparent--on the basis of the proposed interpretation of ILS 944--that the remaining centuries of the centuriate assembly lost even the theoretical right of ratifying or rejecting the selection of candidates made by the prerogative body and, as a result, lost the right to engage in elective "comitia." [58] In A.D. 14, this right was transferred to the Senate--hence the record of ILS 944, "ab senatu cos. dest."--an action that elicited from Tacitus his famous and now intelligible comment, "tum primum e campo comitia ad patres translata sunt." All that remained after the election had been completed in the Senate was the formal declaration ("renuntiatio") that certain individuals had been elected to the higher offices of state. [59]

To sum up: The "centuriae Caesarum" that were established by the Lex Valeria Cornelia in A.D. 5 and augmented in A.D. 19 and A.D. 23 continued to function in the years after Tiberius' elevation to the principate in their capacity as a prerogative body responsible for the "destination" of candidates for the consulate and praetorship. From A.D. 14, however, the names of the "destined" candidates were no longer submitted to an assembled "comitia centuriata" for ratification by the people. Instead, the formal ratification of the decisions made by the "destination" centuries, and thus the formal election itself, was carried in the Senate.

l

CHAPTER 5

The "Conspiracy" of A.D. 39

Suetonius' mention in his biography of the emperor Claudius of a "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" (Claud. 9. 1) is of some importance to those historians who would gain a deeper understanding of Gaius brief but mercurial reign. Within the last hundred years most scholars have accepted the veracity of Suetonius' report and, more significantly, have adhered to the notion that the "coniuratio" was formed prior to Gaius' excursion to Germany in September A.D 39, which, according to the communis opinio, it precipitated. [1] Most scholars, therefore, have focused their attention not so much on the reality of the plot as on the motives which may be attributed to the alleged conspirators. [2]

In this chapter, however, I hope to show that evidence for such a "conspiracy" is almost entirely lacking and that, in fact, there is no support in our ancient sources for the belief that a "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" was formed prior to Gaius' arrival in Germany. Furthermore, I will attempt to explain how the sources admit other interpretations of the affair. Firstly, that Gaetulicus and Lepidus may well have been executed for reasons other than that of complicity in a plot against the emperor. Secondly, that Gaius, having executed these two men, invented the "conspiracy" in order to excuse his actions before the Senate at Rome. Of course, given the very slight nature of the evidence, it is highly likely that such suggestions may never be capable of clear and lasting proof--Gaetulicus and Lepidus may well have formed a conspiracy against Gaius once he had arrived in Germany and after they had learnt of the emperor's intentions to remove them. Nevertheless, I hope to show that there are reasonable grounds for doubting the existence of the "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" in the usual sense of a long standing plot against the emperor, which failed because of Gaius' timely advance into Germany.

I

The chief "conspirators" and their suppression--the accepted version

Before embarking upon a detailed review of the ancient evidence for the "conspiracy" it is probably worthwhile to set out here the beliefs that most scholars hold concerning the identification of the major participants and the steps taken by Gaius in their suppression. The motives, on the other hand, that are attributed to the supposed conspirators will not be examined in detail. The mere revelation that the chief characters in the alleged plot harbored feelings of resentment, of greed ("spes dominationis"), or of insecurity does not justify one in asserting that there was in reality a plot against the emperor.

First and foremost in the alleged plot against Gaius was M. Aemilius Lepidus. Not only had this man been allowed to hold the consulate five years prior to the legal minimum age, he had also been permitted to marry the emperor's favorite sister Drusilla and, after this lady's death, had continued to maintain very close ties to the imperial household. [3] According to one source, when Gaius succumbed to an almost fatal illness at the very beginning of his reign, Lepidus was appointed as his successor. [4] Closely associated with Lepidus in the alleged plot by the most intimate of ties were also Gaius' two surviving sisters Agrippina and Iulia Livilla--though it is the opinion of at least one modern scholar that Agrippina was more culpable than her younger sister. [5] The other major participant in the "conspiracy" was Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, the legate of Upper Germany since A.D. 29-30, and in effective control of four legions protecting the Rhenish frontier. [6] Perhaps also associated with Gaetulicus were his father-in-law, L. Apronius, legate of Lower Germany, and C. Calvisius Sabinus, the legate of Pannonia and possibly one of Gaetulicus' brothers-in-law. [7] In addition to these conspirators, it is commonly held that the consuls dismissed early in September A.D. 39, and whose names are unknown, were also privy to the plot.[8]

Now, in order to suppress the "conspiracy" Gaius is said to have taken several measures. Firtly, he recalled Sabinus to stand trial on an unspecified charge.[9] Secondly, he dismissed the suffecti at the very beginning of September on a trivial pretext.[10] Thirdly, having already initiated a vigorous recruiting campaign, Gaius journeyed north to Germany in September, making a devious and rapid advance and accompanied by, among others, Lepidus, Agrippina, and Iulia Livilla.[11] It is commonly supposed that these three "conspirators" were obliged to accompany Gaius in order to prevent them from causing trouble at Rome during Gaius' absence.[12] Of course, it is acknowledged by many modern authorities that the military preparations undertaken by Gaius in late summer A.D. 39 may have not been directed merely against Gaetulicus; nevertheless, most scholars hold the opinion that Gaius' excursion to Germany was precipitated by his foreknowledge of the plot against him.[13] Thus, it is asserted, the rapid march north was designed to surprise

Gaetulicus at Mainz before that legate could muster troops to oppose the emperor. [14] Once Gaius had arrived in Germany he had Gaetulicus and, very probably [15], Lepidus executed and then sent into exile in the Pontian Islands Agrippina and Iulia Livilla. [16] Agrippina he sentenced to proceed to Rome carrying the ashes of Lepidus, perhaps in a parody of the journey made by her mother after the death of Germanicus. [17] In addition to these actions, Gaius sent news of the detection of the "conspiracy" to Rome, along with three daggers to be deposited in the temple of Mars Ultor. [18] He also instructed that the household effects of the imperial sisters be despatched to his winter residence at Lyon, where he ordered that they be put up for auction. [19]

II

The sources

First and most importantly, the passage of Suetonius that refers to a "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio"

(Claud. 9. 1) is unique. It represents the only ancient authority for a conspiracy in which both Lepidus and Gaetulicus took part. In the same author's biography of the emperor Gaius--written perhaps about the same time as that of Claudius [20] --there is absolutely no mention of such a plot in which these persons were the major participants. Gaetulicus, rather, appears merely as the author of a flattering versicle on Gaius' place of birth [21], while Lepidus appears primarily as the debaucher of Gaius' surviving sisters, guilty also of unspecified "insidiarum adversus se [Gaius]." [22] In Suetonius' biography of Vespasian (Vesp. 2. 3) the conspirators are not mentioned by name. All that is stated is Vespasian's desire to increase the odium of their punishment by proposing that the conspirators' bodies be thrown out unburied. There is, however, no evidence that Gaetulicus' remains were transported to Rome. Indeed, although it may be possible to assume on the basis of the records of the Arval Brethren for 27 October A.D. 39 ("A.d. VI K. Novembr. / ob detecta nefaria con[silia in C. Germa/ni]cum Cn. Lentuli Gaet[ulici

..//L. Salvius] Otho flame[n et pro magistro collegii] / fratrum [Arvalium nomine....immolavit ....]") that Gaetulicus is referred to in *Vesp*. 2. 3, there is no absolute indication that Lepidus himself was considered a conspirator by Vespasian.[23]

Lepidus, in fact, appears most notable in antiquity not for any complicity in a plot against Gaius--for which Suet. *Claud*. 9. 1 is our only authority--but for his intimate relations with Gaius' sisters and, perhaps, with Gaius himself. The later historian Dio (59. 22. 6) states that Lepidus was one of Gaius' victims. Dio, however, does not give even Gaius' overt reasons for executing Lepidus, but rather pointedly describes him as "τὸν ἐραστὴν τὸν ἐρώμενον" and as an adulterer. According to this historian (59. 22. 8f.) Agrippina and Iulia Livilla were exiled precisely because of their illicit relationship with Lepidus. The intimate ties forged by Lepidus with Agrippina also appear in Tacitus *Annals* 14. 2. 3: "[Agrippina] *puellaribus annis stuprum cum Lepido spe dominationis admiserat*." In fact, the topic of Lepidus' adultery seems to have become something of a commonplace in antiquity. In another work by an even later writer--though not necessarily less reliable for that reason--the adulterous union of Lepidus with the emperor's sisters appears to have been the primary cause of his execution: Rutilius Namatianus De Red. 1. 305f. "*Quartus* [Lepidus] *Caesareo dum vult irrepere regno, / Incesti poenam solvit adulterii*."[24] Also other, more nearly contemporary sources for Lepidus' death do not give the reasons for his execution. Seneca (*Ep. Mor*. 4. 7f.) states merely that Gaius ordered Lepidus "*Dextro tribuno praebere cervicem*," while Josephus records only the fact that Lepidus was killed.[25] There is no hint in either source that Lepidus conspired against the emperor.

There is, therefore, apart from *Claud*. 9. 1, no ancient testimony to support the belief that Lepidus was involved in a political conspiracy against Gaius. The "*insidiae*" of which Lepidus was accused in Suet. *Gaius* 24. 3 (see above p. 81) may equally well have been connected with his adulterous activities--a crime enhanced by the eminence of Lepidus' associates and, surely, no less serious than it had been or would be for other members of the imperial household.[26] The not too remote possibility that such a union with Agrippina might well result in male issue could have disturbed Gaius greatly--especially if, as Meise correctly maintains, Gaius' infant daughter Drusilla was born in summer A.D. 39.[27] On the other hand, there is no tangible evidence that Lepidus was not involved in a political conspiracy or in "*insidiae*" that existed independent of his adulterous activities with the emperor's sisters. Nor should we expect such evidence from our ancient sources, if, in fact, he was not involved in such a plot. One argument, however, may be put forward here *e silentio*. There is the strong possibility that in the records of the Arval Brethren cited above (p. 81) Lepidus' name did not appear. According to Henzen's reconstruction, there is no room for a reference to Lepidus in the lacunae of the fragmentary inscription.[28] If this reconstruction is accepted, it is surely possible to believe that Lepidus did not appear in this section of the *AFA* precisely because he was

Drusus was born after his mother's marriage to Octavian on 17 January 38 B.C., it is clear that, according to this scholar's argument, the testamentary adoption of the future emperor Tiberius by M. Gallius must have taken place after Livia had entered the Julian household. This suggestion, however, it quite incompatible with Suetonius' account of the adoption (Tib. 6. 3), "post reditum in urbem a M. Gallio senatore testamento adoptatus hereditate adita mox nomine [Tiberius] abstinuit, quod Gallius adversarum Augusto partium fuerat." Inasmuch as Suetonius tells us explicitly that Tiberius soon abandoned the use of the name Gallius because this man had been a member of the senatorial party opposed to Octavian, it must be considered as extremely unlikely that Octavian and Livia approved the adoption in the first place. It is more probable, therefore, that Tiberius was adopted by

M. Gallius very soon after Tiberius' family returned to Italy in 39 B.C.--especially in view of the fact that Tiberius' father was himself a member of the party opposed to Octavian. In any case, after the marriage in 38 B.C. Tiberius (but not Drusus, Dio 48. 44. 4-5) became the ward of Octavian (Tac. Ann. 1. 3; cf. Seager, op. cit. [above n. 6]: 11). The testamentary adoption, then, must have taken place some time before Livia's marriage to Octavian, in which case Drusus was not yet alive and, as a result, would have had some difficulty in changing his name for the reasons suggested by Levick.

19. See Stein, PIR^2 II: 226; cf. Mommsen, CIL VI 4376.

20. For the adoptions in A.D. 4, see also Tac. Ann. 1. 3. 3, and, especially Suet. Tib. 15. 2 where the correct sequence of adoptions is given: "Gaio et Lucio intra triennium defunctis adoptatur ab Augusto

simul cum fratre eorum M. Agrippa, coactus (Tiberius) prius ipse Germanicum fratris sui filium adoptare." Cf. H.U. Instinsky, Augustus und die Adoption des Tiberius, *Hermes* 94 (1966): 323-343, especially 328, n. 2: *Inst*. 1. 11. 11, "*sic enim et divus Augustus non ante Tiberium adoptavit, quam is Germanicum adoptavit: ut protinus adoptione facta incipiat Germanicus Augusti nepos esse*." See also Fitzler-Seeck, *RE* 10: 369; A.E. Pappano, Agrippa Postumus, *CP* 36 (1941): 31; E. Kornemann, *Doppelprinzipat und Reichstellung im Imperium Romanum*, Leipzig-Berlin (1930): 24ff.; M.-H. Prévost, *Les Adoptions politiques à Rome*, Publications de le'Institut de Droit Romain de l'Université de Paris 5, Paris (1949) 35ff.; L. Lesuisse, L'aspect héréditaire de la succession impériale sous les Julio-Claudiens, *LEC* 30 (1962): 38; Sumner, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 413-435; B.M. Levick, Drusus Caesar and the adoptions of A.D. 4, *Latomus* 25 (1966): 227-244, *id*. *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 49f., *id*. The Fall of Julia the Younger, *Latomus* 35 (1976): 315-315. The reason for the adoption and the chronological problems associated with Germanicus' birth are not apposite here. For a discussion of Germanicus' early name, see below Appendix, "The Early Name of Germanicus," pp. 291 to 296. For the *cognomen* Germanicus, see also I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Soc. Scient. Fenn. Comm. Hum. Litt. 36 2, Helsinki (1965): 52, 201. For the name of Tiberius' own son, Nero Claudius Drusus, see *PIR*^{2}: 219.

21. See Groag, *RE* 3: 2782. For the view that Claudius retained the *cognomen* Drusus, see H. Smilda, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii*, Diss. Gröningen (1896): 14.

22. See above, n. 21, Groag, *loc. cit*.

23. Dio *Frg*. 44: "ὅτι ἐπὶ Μάρκου Κλαυδίου καὶ

Τίτου Σεμπρωνίου ὑπάτων μόνῳ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπωνυμίας τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν παίδων Ῥωμαῖοι παρεκελεύσαντο." See Mommsen, Die Familie des Germanicus, *Hermes* 13 (1878): 262f. (*Hermes* 13 [1878]: 245-265 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 4, Berlin [1906]:271-290.) For a discussion of the word "ἐπωνυμίας" in Dio Frg. 44, see Mommsen, *Römische Staatsrecht*, Leipzig (1887-1888), Vol. 3: 213, n. 3.

24. A. Momigliano, *Claudius, The Emperor and His Achievement*^{2}, trans. G.W.B. Hogarth, Cambridge (1962): 80, n. 2; V.M. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius*, Cambridge, Mass., (1940): 55; K. Kraft, Der politische Hintergrund von Senecas Apocolocyntosis, *Historia* 15 (1966): 111; D. Timpe, *Untersuchungen zur Kontiniutät des frühen Prinzipats*, Historia-Einzelschriften 5, Wiesbaden (1962): 59f.

25. Groag, *loc. cit.* (above n. 21); T. Frank, Claudius and the Pavian Inscription, *CQ* n.s. 2 (1908): 89-92; P. Kneissl, *Die*

Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser, Hypomnemata 23, Gottingen (1969): 30-32.

26. Frank, op. cit. (above n. 25): 92. (Frank's radical suggestion was aimed at dislodging Claudius from being considered, even to a small extent, as a member of the imperial household. Cf. Mommsen, Ber. d. sächs Gesellsch. (1850): 315ff. where the usual interpretation of CIL V 6416 as presenting Augustus' final settlement of the succession problem is expressed.)

27. Charlesworth, CAH 10 (1934): 975.

28. V. Gardthausen, Die Namen des späteren Kaisers Claudius, BpW 40 (1908): 1263f.; M. Stuart, The Date of the Inscription of Claudius on the Arch of Ticinum, AJA 40 (1936): 314-322. The inscription is a dedication to Medullina Camilli f. Ti. Claudii Neronis Germanici sponsa by her pedagogue (CIL X 6561). The inscription is probably to be placed within the period A.D. 8-18. Cf. also

CIL III 381 and Dio 60. 2. 1 and 55. 27. 3.

29. Groag, loc. cit. (above n. 21); K. Vivell, Chronologisch-kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Claudius, Diss. Heidelberg i. B. (1911): 49f.

30. Kneissl, loc. cit. (above n. 25). For Germanicus' early name, see below pp. 291 to 296.

31. Momigliano, loc. cit. (above n. 24), places the adoptions in 4 B.C.--surely a fortuitous error. The error is made worse by the statement in the same note that all the Cornelii Lentuli bore the cognomen Gaetulicus. Cossus Cornelius Lentulus (cos. A.D. 25, PIR^2:335), the elder son of Cossus Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (cos. 1 B.C., PIR^2:333) did not receive his father's honorific cognomen. The younger son, however, Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (cos. A.D. 26, PIR^2: 338ff.) did receive the name.

32. Momigliano, *loc. cit*.

33. Suet. *Claud*. 1. 3, "*praeterea senatus inter alia complura marmoreum arcum cum tropaeis via Appia decrevit et Germanici cognomen ipsi posterisque eius*."

34. On this point, see Smilda, *op. cit*. (above n. 21): 10.

35. On the development of the use of the name Caesar, see, especially, L. Lesuisse, Le titre de Caesar et son evolution au cours de l'histoire de l'empire, *LEC* 29 (1961): 271-287.

36. Cf., for example, *Aug*. 342, 64. 1, 101. 2; *Tib*. 15. 2, *Gaius* 3. 1.

37. For instances of similar phrases in Tacitus, Caesar, Cicero, Sallust, and Curtius, see, especially, R. Enghofer, *Der Ablativus Absolutus bei Tacitus*, Diss. Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg (1961): 74f., 126f. and the authorities cited there. For a further discussion of the phrase "*fratre adoptato*" (*Claud*. 2. 1), see B. Mouchová, Adoption

und Testament in Suetons Kaiserbiographen. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis des Wortschatzes bei Sueton, Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Phil. et Hist. 5, Graecolatina 3 (1966): 55-63, especially 55-58.

38. Horace Car. 4. 4. 27f. (see above n. 17)

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. C.D. Fisher, *Cornelii Taciti Annalium ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri*, Oxford (1906).

2. See W.K. Lacey, Nominatio and the elections under Tiberius, *Historia* 12 (1963): 167-176; B.M. Levick, Imperial control of the elections under the early Principate: Commendatio, Suffragatio, and "Nominatio," *Historia* 16 (1967): 207-230; A.E. Astin, "Nominare" in accounts of elections in the early Principate, *Latomus* 28 (1969): 863-874; M. Pani, *Comitia e Senato. Sulla trasformazione della procedura elettorale a Roma nell'eta di Tiberio*, Bari (1974): 35-80 and the authorities cited there. For "*nominatio*" as a legally defined power, see, especially Th. Mommsen, *Römische Staatsrecht* ^{3}, II, Leipzig (1887-1888): 917ff.; cf. H. Siber, *Römisches Verfassungsrecht in geschicht-*

licher Entwicklung, Lahr (1952): 356 and, for an earlier discussion by the same author, Die Wahlreform des Tiberius, *Festschrift Paul Koschaker*, I, Weimar (1939): 171ff.

3. For this view, rightly rejected by Levick, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 214-216. Cf. A.H.M. Jones, The elections under Augustus, *JRS* 45 (1955): 33; Mommsen, *loc. cit* (above n. 2); O'Brien Moore, *RE Supplb*. 6: 780; G. Tibiletti, *Principe e magistrati repubblicani. Ricerca di storia augustea e tiberiana*, Rome (1953): 122f., 142ff.; M. Hammond, *The Antonine Monarchy*, Rome (1959): 266.

4. See, for example, Lacey, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 171; F. de Visscher, Tacite et les réformes éléctorales d'Auguste et de Tibère, *Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz*, II, Naples (1953): 428.

5. Levick, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 218. See now B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, London (1976): 95f.

6. In addition to the authorities cited above, see also D.C.A. Shotter, Elections under Tiberius, CQ 60 (1966): 321-332 (especially 323ff); R. Frei-Stolba, Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Zürich (1967): 130-146 (especially 140ff.); M.L. Paladini, Le votazioni del senato romano nell'età di Traiano, Athenaeum 37 (1959): 126, n. 413.

7. Cf. Astin, op. cit. (above n. 2): 870ff.; Frei-Stolba, op. cit. (above n. 6): 133ff.

8. Cf. Lacey, op. cit. (above n. 2): 170; R. Syme, Tacitus, Oxford (1958): 759; Shotter, op. cit. (above n. 6): 325, n. 8; Levick, op. cit. (above n. 2): 224; Frei-Stolba, op. cit. (above n. 6): 134, n. 24; Pani, op. cit. (above n. 2): 71.

9. Cf. Jones, op. cit. (above n. 3): 19; Astin, op. cit. (above n. 2): 871. This, of course, is Lacey's view of the electoral process after A.D. 14. According to Lacey, a list was drawn up in A.D. 14 by Augustus

and was accepted by the Senate out of reverence for the dead "princeps". In later years, however, Lacey concludes that the Senate drew up a list of "nominati" (171, 176).

10. Cf. Astin, op. cit. (above n. 2): 871, n. 1: "At that point Tiberius could have been urged to read out one or two more names, viz. those who came next in the returns, thus in effect adding to the number of praetors."

11. Cf. M. Gelzer, Zur neuen Germanicus-Inschrift, Festschrift für R. Egger, I, Klagenfurt (1952): 84ff. Although Lacey, for example, objects to Syme's view (loc. cit. [above n. 8]) that the provisions of the Lex Valeria Cornelia were suspended "ex s.c." in A.D. 14, his own conclusions (see above n. 9) that the Senate became responsible for drawing up a list of "nominati" has the same result of reducing the effective power of the "destination" centuries established in A.D. 5. Cf. Astin,

op. cit. (above n. 2): 871; Jones, *op. cit*. (above n. 3): 18ff.; P.A. Brunt, The Lex Valeria Cornelia, *JRS* 51 (1961): 71-83; F.R.D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus. Books 1 - 6*, Cambridge (1972): 193. See also the authorities cited below n. 46.

12. The literature on the *Tabula Hebana* is immense. See, especially, G. Tibiletti, Il funzionamento dei comizi centuriati alla luce della Tavola Hebana, *Athenaeum* 27 (1949): 210-245; H. Nesselhauf, Die neue Germanicus-Inschrift von Magliano, *Historia* 1 (1950): 105-115; F. della Corte, Lingua e cultura nella Tabula Hebana, *PP* 14 (1950): 109-117, F. de Visscher, La destinatio, *ibid*. 118-131; A. dell'Oro, Rogatio e riforma dei comizi centuriati, *ibid*. 132-150; C. Gatti, Gli honores postumi a Germanico, *ibid*. 151-157; M.A. Levi, La Tabula Hebana e il valore storico, *ibid*. 158-170; W. Seston, Germanicus héros fondateur, *ibid*. 171-184.

For the text of the inscription, see F. de Visscher, F. della Corte, C. Gatti, M.A. Levi, PP 14 (1950): 98-107; Nesselhauf, *op. cit.*, 105-108; J.H. Oliver and R.E.A. Palmer, Text of the Tabula Hebana, AJP 75 (1954): 225-249; V. Ehrenberg and A. H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* ², Oxford (1955): 76-80, no. 94a, 94b; U. Coli, Nuove osservazioni e congetture sulla "tabula Hebana," *Iura* 3 (1952): 90-131; J. Béranger, La démocratie sous l'Empire romain; les opérations éléctorales de la Tabula Hebana et la destinatio, MH 14 (1957): 216-240; Pani, *op. cit.* (above n. 2). See also the other authorities cited in this chapter.

13. At least, that is, until A.D. 23 when similar honors appear to have been voted to Drusus the Younger. For the so-called *Tabula Ilicitana*, see Th. Mommsen, *Eph. Ep.* 9 (1903): 11 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 160. For the possibility, rejected by

Oliver and Palmer, op. cit. (above n. 12): 248, that the Tabula Ilicitana (found near Elche in Spain) is actually another copy of the "rogatio" in honor of Germanicus in A.D. 19, see A.d'Ors, Tabula Ilicitana, Iura 1 (1950): 280-282.

14. See, for example, E.S. Staveley, Greek and Roman Voting and Elections, London (1972): 262, n. 431; id. JRS 65 (1975): 201; Pani, op. cit. (above n. 2): 110ff.; F. Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337), London (1977): 302-303.

15. Levick, op. cit. (above n. 2): 224.

16. So much is clear from the fact that Drusus was already consul designate; Tac. Ann. 1. 14; cf. Lacey, op. cit. (above n. 2): 169f.

17. Here I follow the traditional date (cf. E. Hohl, Wann hat Tiberius das Prinzipat übernommen ?, Hermes 68 (1933): 106-115; H.H. Schmitt, Der pannonische Aufstand des Jahres 14 n. Chr. und der Regierungsantritt des Tiberius, Historia 7 (1958): 381

in preference to that suggested by K. Wellesley, The *dies imperii* of Tiberius, *JRS* 57 (1967): 23-30.

18. Cf. Levick, *op. cit.* (above n. 2): 218.

19. Cf. Wellesley, *op. cit.* (above n. 17): 23f., 29f.; Goodyear, *op. cit.* (above n. 11): 169ff. Pani, *loc. cit.* (above n. 2), suggests that "*nominatio*" under Tiberius was in part a result of prior consultation between Tiberius and the Senate. Clearly, such a suggestion cannot be correct for A.D. 14.

20. Lacey, *op. cit.* (above n. 2): 170f. Opposed by Levick, *op. cit.* (above n. 2): 217; Shotter, *op. cit.* (above n. 6): 325, n. 8; Frei-Stolba, *op. cit.* (above n. 6): 133ff.

21. Vell. Pat. 2. 124. 3: "*Post redditum caelo patrem et corpus eius humanis honoribus, nomen divinis honoratum, primum principalium eius operum fuit ordinatio comitiorum quam manu sua scriptam divus Augustus reliquerat. quo tempore mihi fratrique meo, candidatis*

Caesaris, proxime a nobilissimis ac sacerdot[al]ibus viris destinari praetoribus contigit, consecutis ut neque post nos quemquam divus Augustus ~~*neque*~~ *ante nos Caesar commendaret Tiberius.*"

22. See A.J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus. The Tiberian Narrative (2.94-131)*, Cambridge (1977): 227.

23. In addition to Woodman, *loc. cit*. (above n. 22), see Frei-Stolba, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 145f.

24. Cf. Lacey, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 170: "... Tiberius was not in the habit of altering Augustus' arrangements."

25. Vell. Pat. 2. 124. 3.

26. Levick, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 224.

27. Levick, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 219.

28. Cf. Jones, *op. cit*. (above n. 3): 18. For a contrary opinion to Jones' belief that Augustus allowed some freedom of choice to the "destination" centuries, see Brunt, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 78f. The evidence of Dio, however, (see below

n. 29) clearly suggests restraint on Augustus' part. If we accept that Tiberius consciously attempted to follow Augustus' lead in the earlier years of his reign, it is very probable that his restraint noted in Tac. *Ann*. 1. 15 ("*ne plures quam quattuor ...*") also follows Augustan precedent. For Augustus' restraint, cf. Suet. *Aug*. 56. 1.

29. Dio 55. 34. 2. Brunt, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 78, argues that the "*comitia*" had no real freedom to choose candidates for office. "It might be that in a particular year the emperor cared little which of the qualified candidates was successful; thus in A.D. 7 Augustus presumably observed neutrality until the disorder compelled him to intervene and 'appoint' all the magistrates." Another view, however, is that after A.D. 5 Augustus did not actively influence the elections until the disturbed year of A.D. 7. In A.D. 8, and thereafter, he posted a list of

favored candidates because he wished to avoid the type of disturbance that occurred in A.D. 7. This disturbance was caused, to my mind, by an unaccustomed freedom of choice. In some respects, then, the situation was similar to that which evidently confronted Gaius in A.D. 38-39 (cf. Dio 59. 9. 6, 20. 3-4).

30. Dio 55. 34. 2; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 56. 1. There is no evidence to support the contention that Augustus' list of favored candidates comprised all the available appointments. In fact, the evidence of Suetonius clearly implies the opposite and Tiberius himself appears to have accepted the "*professiones*" of candidates who did not gain his personal recommendation as "*candidati Caesaris*" (Tac. *Ann* 1. 81). Also, Tacitus in *Ann*. 1. 81 appears to suggest that Tiberius was less restrained than Augustus.

31. Accepted by Levick, among others. See above p. 60 and Levick (1976): 95f.

32. Woodman, op. cit. (above n. 22): 225f. (especially, 237), suggests that the "ordinatio comitiorum" included a change in the electoral procedure: "Augustus had been planning to transfer the elections from the people to the senate: he died before he could carry out the plan, which was put into operation by Tiberius in A.D. 14." Such a suggestion, however, cannot be correct. The consular elections had already taken place at the time of Tiberius' accession, presumably under the terms of the Lex Valeria Cornelia prior to the change recorded by Tacitus. Had Augustus wished to make the change, which incidentally Woodman believes to have affected all elections at Rome, it would surely have affected the consular elections in A.D. 14. In any case, Tacitus' record is clear, whatever change in electoral procedure occurred in A.D. 14, that change was effected by Tiberius. There is no evidence at all that Augustus

had anything to do with the change. There is the clear possibility, then, that the change in electoral procedure recorded by Tacitus refers only to the praetorship. This suggestion has been accepted by Béranger, op. cit. (above n. 12): 231; cf. Tacitus' admitted confusion over the manner by which consuls were selected throughout Tiberius' reign (Ann. 1. 81) and his statement, which may only refer to A.D. 60, that "comitia praetorum arbitrio senatus haberi" (Ann. 14. 28. 1).

33. Lacey, op. cit. (above n. 2): 170f.

34. Lacey, op. cit. (above n. 2): 170, n. 1; cf. Frei-Stolba, op. cit. (above n. 6): 143f.; Woodman, op. cit. (above n. 22): 227.

35. For the text, see above n. 21.

36. See above nn. 12, 13.

37. The text cited is from Ehrenberg and Jones, loc. cit. (above n. 12). Here TH 3 is equivalent to Oliver and Palmer,

op. cit. (above n. 12): 227, TH 5-6.

38. G.W. Clarke, The Destinatio centuries in A.D. 14, Historia 13 (1964): 383f.; cf. Oliver and Palmer, op. cit. (above n. 12): 239 (Supplementary note by J.H.O.).

39. See above n. 28.

40. See above nn. 13, 14.

41. Tibiletti, op. cit. (above n. 3): 141-193; cf. Lacey, op. cit. (above n. 2): 167, n. 1; Staveley, op. cit. (above n. 14 [1972]): 262, n. 431; Hammond, op. cit. (above n. 3): 302, nn. 5, 6.

42. In addition to the authorities cited so far in this chapter, see L.R. Taylor, Roman Voting Assemblies, Ann Arbor (1966): 89ff.

43. Cf., for example, Tibiletti, op. cit. (above n. 3): 164ff.; Jones, op. cit. (above n. 3): 13ff.; Lacey, op. cit. (above n. 2): 168; Staveley, op. cit. (above n. 14 [1972]): 219; Siber, op. cit. (above n. 2): 354 [1952], 177f. [1939]. On the "centuriae praerogativae"

cf. Cicero De Div. 1. 103, Pro Mur. 38, Pro Planc. 49; Staveley, op. cit. (above n. 14 [1972]): 155ff.; Taylor, op. cit. (above n. 42): 86ff.

44. Or, perhaps, cast their votes in favor of other candidates whose names were not put forward by the "destination" centuries; cf., for example, Staveley, op. cit. (above n. 14 [1972]) 219.

45. Cf. TLL, "campus," 217; Staveley, op. cit. (above n. 14 [1972]): 152 and n. 283; Vell. Pat. 2. 126. 2.

46. Tac. Ann. 1. 15. The standard view that the centuriate assembly possessed after A.D. 14 the theoretical right of rejecting candidates at this stage of the electoral process makes nonsense of this statement of Tacitus. "... nam ad eam diem, etsi potissima arbitrio principis, quaedam tamen studiis tribuum fiebant." Here I must agree with Woodman, op. cit. (above n. 22): 226, that, while it might appear at first glance that Tacitus here refers to the

lesser magistracies, there is in reality no reference to them; cf. Levick, *op. cit.* (above n. 2): 218, n. 44; Gelzer, *Kleine Schriften*, II, Wiesbaden (1962): 365: "*Tacitus denkt freilich bei* tribus *an des Gesamtvolk*."

47. S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London (1929): 460; Taylor, *op. cit.* (above n. 42): 48ff.

48. Cf. Staveley, *op. cit.* (above n. 14 [1972]): 220.

49. The last recorded recorded trial for "*perduellio*"--the chief judicial responsibility of the centuriate assembly was that of C. Rabirius in 63 B.C. See Cicero *Pro Rab.*; Dio 37.27; Suet. *Iul.* 12. See also Taylor, *op. cit* (above n. 42): 105f. Evidence for the exercise of legislative functions by the centuriate assembly virtually disappears in the first century after Christ. Indeed, the legislative responsibilities of this assembly and their relations to comitial legislation in general

is a thorny problem deserving of a monograph. In simple terms, we should be able to discern a difference in comitial legislation between enactments of the "*comitia centuriata*" and enactments of the "*comitia tributa*" and, perhaps, the "*concilium plebis*." According to W. Leibenam, *RE* 4: 712f., after the enactment of the *Lex centuriata de potestate censoria* of 22 B.C. (cf. Dio 54. 2; Suet. *Aug*. 37), there is evidence only of comitial legislation coming before the "*comitia tributa*" and none for similar legislation by the centuriate assembly. While such an assertion may be doubted, I can find no single example of a "*lex rogata*" certainly voted upon by the "*comitia centuriata*" after the death of Augustus. The *Lex Iunia* (*Norbana* ?) concerning manumission is uncertainly dated to 17 B.C. or A.D. 19 and, like the *Lex Iunia Petronia* (A.D. 19) and the *Lex Petronia (de servis* ?) (A.D. 61 ?), could well have been a "*lex data*" promulgated on the authority of the magistrate without requiring a vote by the assembled "comitia centuriata." The Lex de Imperio Vespasiani (A.D. 69-70) is anomalous in that it contains elements of expression appropriate to a "Senatus consultum" rather than to the "lex rogata" it purports to be (cf. Hammond, op. cit. [above n. 3]: 328). The "Lex de abrogatione" passed by Domitian (Tac. Hist. 4. 47: "abrogati inde legem ferente Domitiano consulatus quos Vitellius dederat ...") is considered by Hammond, op. cit. (above n. 3): 348, n. 5, to be a law passed by the centuriate assembly "since this assembly elected the consuls." If, however, the suggestions made in this chapter are accepted, Hammond's argument is clearly invalid. In any case, this law could also have been promulgated as a "lex data." The last recorded piece of comitial legislation was an agrarian law passed by Nerva, presumably through the "comitia tributa" by virtue of his "tribunicia *potestas*" (*Dig*. 47. 21. 3. 1). In addition to the authorities cited here, see also G. Rotundi, *Leges Publicae Populi Romani*, Milan (1912): 109-113, 463-471.

50. *ILS* 944 = *CIL* IX 2342. On this inscription (the reading is that of Ehrenberg and Jones, *op. cit*. [above n. 12]: 109, no. 213) see Mommsen, *CIL*, *ad loc*.; *Römisches Staatsrecht*^{3}, II: 923, n. 1; Dessau, *ILS*, *ad loc*. The reading accepted here and by all modern authorities may be inaccurate.

51. Cf. Pani, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 27f.

52. See A. Degrassi, *I Fasti consolari dell' impero romano dal 30 av. Cr. al 613 d. Cr*., Rome (1952): 7f., 198: M. Iunius Silanus Torquatus (cos. A.D. 19); cf., however, Tibiletti, *op. cit*. (above n. 3): 188f.

53. Cf., for example, Staveley, *op. cit*. (above n. 14 [1972]): 261, n. 429; Levick, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 212f.

54. Cf., for example, Hammond, *op. cit*. (above

n. 3): 348, n. 5.

55. See above p.64f. and n. 53.

56. See E. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità romane*, Vol. 2, Part 2, Spoleto (1910), reprint Rome (1961): 1709-1710. Livy 10. 22. 1: "*Nemini dubium erat, quin Q. Fabius omnium consensu destinaretur, eumque et praerogativae et primo vocatae omnes centuriae consulem cum L. Volumnio dicebant*." See also Livy 39. 32. 9. Pliny *Pan*. 57. 1, 77. 1, 95. 1. Suetonius *Dom*. 10. 4: "*Flavium Sabinum alterum e patruelibus, quod eum comitiorum consularium die destinatum perperam praeco non consulem ad populum, sed imperatorem pronuntiasset*." Cf., also, Tac. *Hist*. 2. 71: "*et Valerium Marinum destinatum a Galba consulem distulit ....*"

57. See also *TLL* V 755, 758, 759; de Ruggiero, *op. cit*. (above n. 56): 1711.

58. After Gaius had rescinded Tiberius' arrangements in A.D. 38 (Dio 59. 9. 6), the experiment was seen to fail because

of the lack of experience of the people in conducting any business "ἐλευθέρως." Thus, the result of Gaius' experiment was that "τὸ μὲν σχήμα τῆς δημοκρατίας" was preserved without purpose. Gaius, therefore, reverted to Tiberius' arrangements. Dio's evidence at this juncture can only have relevance if the "σχήμα τῆς δημοκρατίας" refers to the penultimate stage in a comitial election, i.e. after "destination" and before the declaration of the names of those who had been elected. If it was merely the function of the "destination" centuries that were assumed by the Senate in A.D. 14, the "form of democratic government" would have been preserved already by the maintenance of the theoretical right of the remaining centuries of the "comitia centuriata" to accept or reject the candidates thus "destined," whether or not only the appropriate number of candidates presented themselves for the same number of posts available.

59. Cf. Pliny *Pan*. 92. 3: "*suffragator in curia, declarator in campo*" clearly indicates an election in the Senate. *Pan*. 63. 2f. yields the same result: "*perpessus es longum illud carmen comitiorum*" does not show that Trajan was theoretically unaware of the election results when he first entered the Campus Martius, but that he went there to hear that he *had been* elected consul (cf. Hammond, *op. cit*. [above n. 3]: 323, n. 3). The same interpretation should also be applied to Dio's description of the elections in A.D. 32 (58. 20. 3-4). It is evident in Dio's account (*contra* Woodman, *op. cit*. [above n. 22]: 226) that the candidates were already assured of gaining office--a clear indication that the election had already taken place--but were "ἔς τε τὸν δῆμον καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ... ἐσιόντες ἀπεδείκνυντο" to hear the formal declaration of their success ("*renuntiatio*"). Only after this formal

declaration could candidates who had been elected to office be considered as magistrates designate. This was the very last stage in the electoral process which took place, before A.D. 14, after the candidates "destined" by the "*centuriae Caesarum*" had been accepted (or rejected) by the assembled "*comitia centuriata*." Cf. *OGI* 379. 5: "ὕπατος ἀποδεδειγμένος"= "*consul designatus*." Even after the centuriate assembly had ratified the selection of the prerogative or "destination" centuries, the presiding magistrate could refuse to make the formal declaration that a particular individual had been elected; cf., especially, Pani, *op. cit.* (above n. 2): 40f.

On the problems presented by Pliny (also *Pan*. 71. 7-72. 1; *Ep*. 3. 20, where the election clearly occurs in the Senate), see, especially, Shotter, *op. cit.* (above n. 6). It may not be legitimate to use Pliny to support the suggestions made here.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. See, for example, the many authorities cited by E. Meise, _Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Julisch-Claudischen Dynastie_, Vestigia, _Beiträge zur alten Geschichte_, Band 10, Munich (1969): 91, most of the scholars to whose works I have referred in subsequent notes, and especially, J.C. Faur, La première conspiration contre Caligula, _RBPhH_ 51 (1953): 13-50 which comprises the most recent detailed analysis of the alleged conspiracy.

2. Cf. Meise, _op. cit_. (above n. 1): 91ff., 245ff. Also, A. Bergener, _Die führende Senatorenschicht in frühen Prinzipat (14 - 68 n. Chr.)_, Diss. Bonn (1965): 119ff. The motives that have been attributed to the supposed conspirators are legion and include such topics as jealousy on the part of Iulia Livilla or Agrippina, desire for political advantage

or power, the need of those promoted by Seianus for personal security, and reactions against Gaius' cruelty, his hellenizing or egyptizing tendencies. Such motives--no matter how reasonable they appear in themselves--can act neither as proof nor as evidence for the reality of the plot.

3. See PIR^2: 61-62 for the ancient sources. Perhaps the close ties between Lepidus and the imperial household were also the result of kinship, see J.P.V.D. Balsdon, The Emperor Gaius, Oxford (1934): 43, and CAH X, Table I. Cf. also Z. Stewart, Sejanus, Gaetulicus, and Seneca, AJP 74 (1953): 74, n. 34.

4. Dio 59. 22. 6-7; cf. Suet. Gaius 24. 2 where Drusilla is described as the heir to empire--a possibility accepted as such by Th. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht^3, Band 2, Leipzig (1887-88): 1135, n. 5 but largely ignored by many later scholars.

5. Cf. Balsdon, Gaius: 75; Meise, op. cit.

(above n. 1): 121, n. 176.

6. See PIR^2: 338ff. The year in which Gaetulicus entered upon his command is not known. According to Dio 59. 22. 5, Gaetulicus was legate of Upper Germany for ten years, hence Stein, RE 4: 1385 opts for A.D. 29, while Groag, PIR^2, loc. cit., chooses A.D. 30, as does R. Sealey, The political attachments of L. Aelius Seianus, Phoenix 15 (1961): 102. It is probable that Dio reckoned inclusively so that the year in which tenure began should also count in the total of ten years in which the post was held.

7. For Apronius see PIR^2: 188ff. It is not known when Apronius relinquished command of Lower Germany. For Sabinus, who was Gaetulicus' partner in the consulate of A.D. 26, see PIR^2: 85. The only evidence for a familial relationship between Sabinus and Gaetulicus is the name of Sabinus' wife Cornelia. For Sabinus, see also below p. 93ff.

8. Suet. Gaius 26. 3; Dio 59. 20. 1-3. Cf. Balsdon, Gaius: 72, n. 1. For suggestions, see G.B. Townend, Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny, Hermes 89 (1961): 235; Bergener, op. cit. (above n. 2): 121; A. Degrassi, I Fasti Consolari dell'Impero Romano, Rome (1952): 11; Hanslik, RE 8a 2: 1981.

9. Dio 59. 18. 4. See below p. 93ff.

10. See above n. 8, and below p. 97ff.

11. For the recruiting campaign which started before Gaius left Rome, see Suet. Gaius 43, id. Galba 6. 3. Ritterling, RE 12: 1798, 1508, 1551 has shown that there are grounds for believing that detachments were drawn from Spain (IV Macedonica) and from Egypt (III Cyrenaica, XII Deiotariana), but see Faur, op. cit. (above n. 1): 29, n. 50. In addition to these troops, there are strong arguments in favor of the establishment at about this time of the legions XV and XII Primigeniae (Ritterling, op. cit., 1244-9,

1758, 1797; J.P.V.D. Balsdon, Notes concerning the principate of Gaius, *JRS* 24 [1934]: 13-16; Syme, *CAH* X: 788-789). Some scholars believe that these two legions were raised by Claudius: cf. A. Momigliano, *Claudius, The Emperor and His Achievement*[2], trans. G.W.B. Hogarth, Cambridge (1962): 111, n. 37; R.W. Davies, The abortive invasion of Britain by Gaius, *Historia* 15 (1966): 126. In the absence of any new epigraphic evidence, most recent scholars have accepted the earlier date for the establishment of the two legions: cf. P. Bicknell, The emperor Gaius' military activities in A.D. 40, *Historia* 17 (1968): 498, n. 15; G.R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier*. London (1969): 23. Other scholars appear to have reserved judgment: cf. H. Schönberger, The Roman frontier in Germany. An archaeological survey, *JRS* 59 (1969) and G. Webster, *The Roman Imperial Army*, London (1969), neither of whom refer to the problem. For the journey north, see also Dio 59. 21. 2 and below p. 97ff.

12. Cf. Basldon, *Gaius*: 73.

13. Cf. Dio 59. 21. 1f. who asserts that German hostility was only a pretext for the expedition and that the real reason was Gaius' need for money. For the standard view, see Balsdon, *Gaius*: 73; Bicknell, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 498, accepted by many scholars, cf. D. Fishwick, The annexation of Mauretania, *Historia* 20 (1971): 467ff., Faur, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 22ff.

14. For the probability that Gaius journeyed directly to Mainz, see Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 17, disputed by Faur, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 30ff., 48 where it is suggested, plausibly enough, that the point of rendezvous was not Mainz but Lyon. Identification of the point of rendezvous, however, neither encourages nor discourages belief in the authenticity

of the alleged plot.

15. Dio 59. 22. 6. According to Suet. Gaius 24. 3, there was a "causa Aemilii Lepidi." If Lepidus was executed in Germany or at Lyon, it is clear that such a trial did not take place at Rome, that it was held posthumously, or that Suetonius simply was in error.

16. Dio 59. 22. 8. For the suggestion--without evidence--that Iulia Livilla was exiled in A.D. 38, see G. Ferrero, Les Femmes des Césars, Paris (1911): 238. According to Suet. Nero 6. 3, Agrippina was exiled after the death of her husband Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, which, if we accept R.M. Geer, Notes on the early life of Nero, TAPA 63 (1931): 59-61, took place in A.D. 40. Suetonius may be wrong (cf. Balsdon, Gaius: 75, n. 2); nevertheless, the humiliating journey must have taken some time to effect, with the result that Agrippina may not have left Rome until A.D. 40.

17. Dio 59. 22. 9; cf. Tac. Ann. 3. 1.
See also below p. 105f.

18. Dio 59. 22. 8; Suet. Gaius 24. 3.
See also below n. 67.

19. Suet. Gaius 39. 1. Cf. Balsdon, Gaius: 75, n. 3.

20. For example, the quotations from letters of Augustus, Suet. Gaius 8. 3; Claud. 4 perhaps collated while Suetonius was still employed in an official capacity at Rome (cf. A. Macé, Essai sur Suétone, Paris [1900]: 204-210; G.B. Townend, Suetonius and his influence, in Latin Biography, ed. T.A. Dorey, London [1967]: 87f.).
For the possibility that evidence for the lives of Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius was acquired shortly before Suetonius was dismissed from his appointment "ab epistulis" see G.B. Townend, The date of composition of Suetonius' Caesares, CQ 9 (1959): 293. R. Syme, Tacitus, Oxford (1958): 780, suggested that the biographies from Caesar to Nero were designed as an

entity and published as such. Townend (1967): 88, however, suggested that the work dedicated to the praetorian prefect Septicius Clarus (Johannes Lydus *de Mag.* 2. 6) *circa* A.D. 122 comprised only the lives of Caesar and Augustus. The problem of the relative chronology of Suetonius "*Vita Caesarum*" is all but intractable. Cf. also Funaioli, *RE* 4a 1: 612; M. Bassols de Climent, *C. Suetonio Tranquilo. Vida de los doce Césares*, Barcelona (1964): XXXIf. Four of the most recent works on Suetonius have no discussion of the problem; W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, Zetemata 1, Munich (1963); G. D'Anna, *Le idee letterarie di Suetonio*, Florence (1967); B. Mouchová, *Studie zu Kaiserbiographien Suetons*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae Phil. et Hist., Monographia 22 (1968); H. Gugel, *Studien zur biographischen Technik Suetons*, Wiener Studien, Beiheft 7, Vienna (1977). According to F. della

Corte, Suetonio eques Romanus, Milan (1958): 12ff. the work was published in its entirety in A.D. 122 (cf. Mace, op. cit. [above]: 204ff.).

21. Suet. Gaius 7. 1.

22. Suet. Gaius 24. 3.

23. E.M. Smallwood, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Gaius, Claudius and Nero, Cambridge (1967): 14. See also below p. 108.

24. The word used here by Rutilius Namatianus which described Lepidus' ambitions ("irrepere") can hardly be used as evidence for a conspiracy which based its success on a violent act; namely the murder of the emperor.

25. Josephus Ant. J 19. 20 and 49. Here Josephus is concerned primarily with the part played by L. Annius Vinicianus in the succesful plot against Gaius. Josephus states that Vinicianus joined in that conspiracy out of a desire to avenge Lepidus and because friendship

with Lepidus had endangered his life. That Vinicianus was in peril was not, according to Josephus, the result of conspiratorial activities in A.D. 39. Rather it was the result of Gaius' irrational fury. (Contra Balsdon, Gaius: 102.)

26. For example, Pompeia, Caesar's wife; Julia, daughter of Augustus; and Messalina. Of course, it would be wrong to deny that the charge of adultery was never "a valuable political weapon" (T.A. Dorey, Adultery and propaganda in the early Roman empire, Univ. Birmingham Hist. J 8, 1 [1961]: 1). Nevertheless, we may assume that such a weapon could not have been used so effectively against Julia and Messalina, for example, had not the crime itself been considered a most grave offence.

27. Meise, op. cit. (above n. 1): 119; Balsdon, Gaius: 48. See Suet. Gaius 25. 3f.; Dio 59. 23. 7. Cf. also Phillips,

The emperor Gaius' abortive invasion of Britain, Historia 19 (1970): 371 contra Huelsen, EE 8: 327 and CIL VI 32347, who places the marriage with Milonia Caesonia after the events of October A.D 39 (so Dio ad loc., cf. A. Garzetti, From Tiberius to the Antonines, London (1974): 99 where it is stated that the marriage took place at Lyon). The chronology is confused and has depended in part, at least, on a fragment of the Acta Fratrum Arvalium which may refer to a sacrifice on behalf of Caesonia in June A.D. 40 (CIL, loc. cit., W. Henzen, Acta Fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt, Berlin (1874): LI; Smallwood, op. cit. (above n. 23): 14. Phillips, loc. cit., in an attempt to explain Dio's evident confusion, argued that the fragment should refer to June A.D. 39. It is possible, however, to see that the marriage and subsequent birth of Drusilla took place before Gaius left Rome in September A.D.

39, without, that is, having recourse to Phillips' argument. It is clear from Perseus *Sat*. 6. 43-47 that Caesonia remained in Rome during Gaius' Germanic campaign and that she *already* held a position of some authority in Gaius' house: "*... missa est a Caesare laurus* / *insignem ob cladem Germanae pubis et aris* / *frigidus excutitur cinis ac iam postibus arma*, / *iam chlamydas regum, iam lutea gausapa captis* / *essedaque ingentes locat Caesonia Rhenos*." (For a brief chronology, see also Fishwick, *op. cit*. (above n. 13): 467ff.)

28. Henzen, *AFA* (1874): LXIX supplies, after Gaetulicus' name "[*b(ovem) m(arem) immolavit L. Salvius] Otho*." Cf. H. Smilda, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii*, Diss. Groningen (1896): 34.

29. Tac. *Ann*. 6. 30, see also above n. 7.

30. *PIR*^{2}: 190f.

31. Faur, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 46. It must be noted, however, that Faur, like

many other researchers, never questioned the reality of the alleged plot. His further identification of probable or possible conspirators (pp. 35-46) is a natural consequence of that belief and of his detailed research. Faur also notes (p. 14, 17) the remarkable silence of the ancient sources concerning the "conspiracy" and wonders if there was a deliberate attempt on the part of our sources to withold information. Perhaps not, if the plot was not really authentic (see below, n. 37). For one of the possible "conspirators" see now D. Fishwick and B.D. Shaw, Ptolemy of Mauretania and the conspiracy of Gaetulicus, Historia 25 (1976): 490-494, especially, 494: "... actual complicity [of Ptolemy] should be considered no more than an outside possibility."

32. Cf. Balsdon, Gaius: 83, n. 1. See also below p. 107ff.

33. See above, n. 14.

34. Schönberger, op. cit. (above n. 11): 153.

35. R. Nierhaus, Das swebische Gräberfeld von Diersheim, Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 28 (1966): 194ff., 230ff.

36. See above, n. 20.

37. The lack of any direct reference to a conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus in Suetonius' life of Gaius can hardly be explained by judicious reticence on the part of the sources used by the biographer in the composition of that life --a reticence which, it may be suggested, was no longer necessary for the sources employed in the composition of the life of Claudius. Such reticence would surely imply the fear of imperial disfavor stimulated by a surviving participant in the alleged conspiracy. After the death of Iulia Livilla in A.D. 42, only Agrippina remained to fit the bill. Certainly, after Agrippina had been re-instated in the imperial household, she would have been in a position better than

most to suppress mention of the alleged conspiracy. Nevertheless, the very sources which, it may be said, glossed over the existence of the "conspiracy" out of fear, perhaps, of Agrippina must certainly have been those that vilified her because of her adulterous activities. A strange form of reticence.

38. Meise, op. cit. (above n. 1): 91

39. Balsdon, Gaius: 71; cf. Bergener, op. cit. (above n. 2): 119ff. where it is suggested that Sabinus' recall stimulated the "conspiracy," cf. Faur, op. cit. (above n. 1): 22f.

40. PIR^2: 85.

41. Th. Mommsen, Römisches Strafrecht, Leipzig (1899): 700, and especially nn. 1-4 for the ancient evidence. On Cornelia's adultery, see also Faur, op. cit. (above n. 1): 20f.

42. See above n. 8.

43. Suet. Gaius 23. 1, "... Actiacas Siculasque victorias, ut funestas p. R. et calamitosas,

vetuit sollemnibus feriis celebrari." See P. Ceaușescu, Caligula et le legs d'Auguste, *Historia* 22 (1973): 270f. where no mention is made of the alleged conspiracy.

44. Suet. *Claud*. 9. 1, "*primum in ipso consulatu, quod Neronis et Drusi fratrum Caesaris statuas segnius locandas ponendasque curasset, paene honore summotus est*."

45. H. Willrich, Caligula, *Klio* 3 (1903): 308; Balsdon, *Gaius*: 73. Faur, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 27, n. 42 rightly sees nothing surprising in the presence of praetorian soldiers in the entourage.

46. For Passienus Crispus, see *Schol. ad Juv*. 4. 81; for Claudius Etruscus, see Statius *Silvae* 3. 3. 69ff.; for Agrippa and Antiochus, see Dio 59. 24. 1 (cf. M.P. Charlesworth, *Five Men. Character Studies from the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Mass., [1936]: 13). According to Dio 59. 21. 2, many people accompanied Gaius to Germany.

47. Gaius probably did not return to Rome until May A.D. 40 at the earliest (see above n. 27). For the suggestion that Gaius had some thought for his comfort, see also Dio 59. 21. 2.

48. See above n. 46. According to Suetonius (*Vit. Pass. Crisp*.) this question concerning concerning Crispus' indulgence in incest with his sister was asked by Nero.

49. Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 16ff.; cf. Faur, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 30ff.

50. Cf., for example, Bicknell, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 498.

51. Stein, *RE* 4: 1385; Syme, *CAH* X: 788.

52. See above p. 88f.

53. See above n. 11

54. Although, according to Dio, Gaius' real reason was his insatiable need for money.

55. See above p. 95.

56. Cf., for example, Balsdon, *Gaius*: 76ff.; Bicknell, *op. cit*. (above n. 11): 498ff.

57. See above n. 24.

58. Suet. *Gaius* 24. 3. H.G. Mullens, The

women of the Caesars, Greece and Rome 11 (1941-42): 60, 62, suggested that adultery was the cause of Lepidus' removal, but did not support the suggestion by an appeal to the sources.

59. Dorey, *op. cit.* (above n. 26): 1.

60. See above n. 27.

61. Dio 59. 22. 9.

62. Dio 59. 22. 8.

63. See above p. 84.

64. Balsdon, *Gaius*: 83, n. 1.

65. Cf., for example, R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*, Vol. 2, Hannover and Leipzig (1904): 90f.

66. See above n. 64.

67. Another possibility remains if we accept Henzen's reconstruction of the record of the Arval Brethren for 27 October A.D. 39 (see above n. 28); namely that Gaetulicus was not associated by Gaius even in such an invented plot. Certainly, such a possibility would explain Gaetulicus'

absence from a conspiracy in Suetonius' life of Gaius. Moreover, the daggers which, according to Dio 59. 22. 7, were sent from Germany and which, according to Suet. *Gaius* 24. 3, were "*in necem* [Gaius] *suam praeparatos*" and used as evidence in the "*causa Aemilii Lepidi*," were associated in antiquity with Lepidus, Agrippina, and Iulia Livilla. (The daggers themselves have little value as evidence for the reality of the alleged conspiracy for they were never used for their avowed purpose. They must, however, stand as further evidence for the propagandist nature of Gaius' report from Germany. Cf. Gelzer, *RE* 10: 403, where it is emphasized that our knowledge of the plot stems ultimately from the emperor's report.)

68. For the possibility that Gaetulicus' incompetence played some part, at least, in his removal, see Willrich, *op. cit.* (above n. 45): 307; U. Linnert, *Beiträge*

zur Geschichte Caligulas, Diss. Jena (1908): 81.

69. See above n. 67 for the possibility that Gaetulicus may not have been included in the "invented" plot. Lepidus was not the only man ever to suffer from an adulterous relationship with Agrippina, cf. the banishment of Tigellinus Sophonius (Dio 59. 23. 9).

70. Cf. E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus, Annalen*, Vol. 4, *Büch. 14-16*, Heidelberg (1968): 26 for a note on Tac. *Ann*. 14. 2 2, "*... missglückten angeblichen Verschwörung des Lentulus Gaetulicus ....*"

* This chapter has been accepted for publication in *Latomus*.

Notes to Chapter 6

1. S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, Oxford (1971): 281, 283, and, especially, 287; S. Eitrem, Zur Apotheose, *Symbolae Osloenses* 10 (1932): 54f. Cf., inter al., G.J.D. Aalders, *Caligula, zoon van Germanicus*, Aasen (1959): 26ff.
2. Seneca *de Tran. An*. 14. 9: "*... nec iam procul erat tumulus in quo Caesari deo nostro fiebat cotidianum sacrum*." D.M. Pippidi, *Recherches sur le culte impériale*, Paris (1941): 75ff. suggests that this passage of Seneca should refer to Augustus. F. Taeger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, Band 2, Stuttgart (1960): 294f. suggests that it refers to Gaius, "*mit grausamer Ironie, als er als Hinrichtungsstätte den Ort nannte, an dem dem Kaiser täglich Opfer dargebracht wurden*." The same suggestion is made by K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Handbuch der Altertums-

wissenschaft, Abt. 4, Teil 4, Munich (1960): 316, n. 1: "es ist mit bitterer Ironie von Caligula gesagt, und mit tumulus ist der Richtplatz gemeint." Clearly, if Taeger and Latte are correct, the temple associated with the cult of Gaius in A.D. 40 perhaps was never completed, and the "tumulus" in Seneca's account may be considered to refer to a temporary altar (cf. the temporary altar on the site of the future temple of Fortuna Muliebris on which see D. Fishwick, Templum Divo Claudio Constitutum, Britannia 3 [1972]: 177). On the temple associated with the cult of Gaius, see below pp. 134 to 148.

3. Cf. also Aurelius Victor Lib. de Caes. 3. 10; Josephus BJ 2 184-203. Although it is not known when Philo composed his invective against Gaius, it is as likely as not that it was written during the reign of Claudius, cf. A. Pelletier, S.J., Legatio ad Gaium, Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie, Paris (1972): 20f. Josephus,

of course, composed his Antiquities during the reign of Domitian.

4. The sources of Josephus remain a matter for conjecture. It is generally agreed, however, that, for AJ 19 at least, he was much indebted to the consular historian Cluvius Rufus; cf. Th. Mommsen, Cornelius Tacitus und Cluvius Rufus, Gesammelte Schriften 7, Berlin (1909): 224-252, A. Momigliano, Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone, RAL 8 (1932): 305-307, G.B. Townend, The sources of Greek in Suetonius, Hermes 88 (1960): 102, J.P.V. D. Balsdon, The Emperor Gaius (Caligula), Oxford (1934): 223f. Doubt in this matter has been expressed, for example, by W. Steidle, Sueton und die antike Biographie, Munich (1963): 77ff., R. Syme, Tacitus, Oxford (1958): 286f., and L.H. Feldman, The sources of Josephus 'Antiquities', Book 19, Latomus 21 (1962): 320-333. None of these writers regards Philo as a

major source--or hardly even a minor source--for Josephus' account. Nevertheless, both Philo and Josephus were prominent men in the Jewish milieu of the Roman world and, despite the several divergencies in their accounts, it is quite possible that Josephus had knowledge of Philo's Legatio ad Gaium.

5. See, for example, below pp. 127ff.

6. Philo Leg. ad Gaium 78ff. On this point, see E.M. Smallwood, Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium, Leiden (1961): 193ff.

7. J. Gagé, "Basiléia" Les Césars, les rois d'Orient et les "Mages", Collection d'Études Anciennes, Paris (1968): 104.

8. On this difficult question, see Balsdon, op. cit. (above n. 4): 227; F. Millar, A Study of Cassius Dio, Oxford (1964): 85ff., 105 (where it is suggested, contra Balsdon, that Dio may have had some knowledge of Suetonius' work). Perhaps, as Townend suggests (above n. 4, 115-117), both Suetonius and Dio made some use of

information supplied by Ti. Claudius Balbillus, sometime Prefect of Egypt (also Millar, *op. cit*., 87). Although Suetonius' account differs from that of Dio in several respects (see, for example, below, p. 134ff.), there is a sufficient congruency between the two to support the belief that, at the very least, Dio and Suetonius made use of a common source.

9. Seneca *Ep*. 78. 6; Dio 59. 19. 7-8.

10. Josephus *AJ* 18. 259: "Φίλων ὁ προεστὼς τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῆς πρεσβείας." On the embassy, see Smallwood, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 24ff.

11. See Smallwood, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 315f. On the use of the formula "Epiphanes", see A.D. Nock, Notes on the ruler cult, I - IV, *JHS* 48 (1928): 38-41 (cf. *JHS* 45 [1925]: 41, n. 110). Although it should be recognized that there was nothing extraordinary in the proposed nomenclature for the temple "Διὸς Ἐπιφανοῦς Νέου ... Γαΐου," it should also

be emphasized that, inasmuch as the temple was not dedicated to Gaius, the name of the temple might merely have been an educated conjecture on the part of Philo himself.

12. Cf., for example, the many examples cited by Weinstock, op. cit., (above n. 1): 304; Taeger, op. cit. (above n. 2): 186ff.; and, especially, those in M.M Ward, The association of Augustus with Jupiter, SMSR 9 (1933): 203-224 (especially, 217-220).

13. In Josephus, AJ 18. 301, Gaius is said to have countermanded his order for the erection of the statue after Agrippa I's personal intercession. In BJ 2. 203 this countermand is not mentioned. In Philo, Leg. ad Gaium 276-333, the temple was saved by a letter to Gaius from Agrippa, but Gaius later returned to his original plan (Leg. ad. Gaium 337). Also, the chronology of the affair is not consistent. On the whole problem, see Smallwood, op. cit.

(above n. 6): 31-36, 256-313. On the chronology of Gaius' attack on the temple at Jerusalem, see, especially, E.M. Smallwood, The chronology of Gaius' attempt to desecrate the temple, *Latomus* 16 (1957): 3-17.

14. Suet. *Gaius* 22. 2: "*... divinam ex eo maiestatem asserere sibi coepit; datoque negotio, ut simulacra numinum religione et arte praeclara, inter quae Olympii Iovis, apportarentur e Graecia, quibus capite dempto suum imponeret, partem Palatii ....*" On the use of the statue see below, p. 127, n. 26; p.133, n. 32. On the antedating of Gaius' divine aspirations, see Smallwood, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 191f., 207. It is noteworthy that in Josephus' account there is no suggestion that Gaius' desire to bring the statue to Rome stemmed from a sense of identification with Iuppiter.

15. Dio 59. 28. 4: "... αὐτὸς δὲ ἕτερον ἐνέστησε."

16. As Smallwood suggests, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 292, Philo had first-hand knowledge of the affair and may have even aided Agrippa I draft the letter to Gaius which he alleges saved the temple. Also, Josephus was close to that king's son, Agrippa II, and thus may be presumed to have had a reliable source of information at hand--however he may have used that source; cf. Feldman, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 332.

17. Weinstock, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 287ff. On Caesar, see also L.R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 1, Middletown (1931): 68ff.; P. Lambrechts, César dans l'historiographie contemporaine, *AC* 23 (1954): 130f., n. 5; Taeger, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 69ff.; and Steidle, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 62f.

18. See above n. 17. Weinstock, however, does find many parallels between Caesar's actions and those of Gaius. He appears to assume that Gaius in reality became a

god in his lifetime and it is this assumption that is used to support his own contention. It is possible, however, to view both Caesar's and Gaius' actions, perhaps, as an attempt to bring about a monarchy. For parallels between Caesar and Gaius, see Weinstock, 217, 241, 287, 283, 325, 333, 382.

19. The word "ἀδελφός" may mean "kinsman" or "brother." As "brother" it would indicate Gaius' feeling of equality.

20. *AJ* 19. 11: "Εἰς τοῦτο δε προὔβη τὸ μανικὸν αὐτῷ, ὥστε ..."; cf. Seneca *de Ira* 1. 20. 9: "*dementia*"; Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 34: "... ἐπιμανῆ κατεφαίνετο."

21. Smallwood, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 315.

22. The other *cognomina* were "*pius*," "*castrorum filius*," and "*pater exercituum*."

23. R. Fre-Stolba, Inoffizielle Kaisertitulaturen im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr., *MH* 26 (1969): 28.

24. For the use of this formula in reference to Augustus, see *CIL* XII 1845, and for

Tiberius, CIL XI 3517. Neither reading is secure (Fre-Stolba, op. cit., 28, n. 80). According to Frei-Stolba, our first sure evidence for its use is in an inscription dated to 18 March A.D. 69, CIL X 7852. For its use by Trajan, in an alimentary inscription, see CIL XI 1147, and for Hadrian, for example, CIL III 586 and (in Rome itself) CIL VI 207. For Hadrian's undoubted identification with Zeus in the Greek east, see the epigraphic evidence supplied in Taeger, op. cit. (above n. 2): 376. See also Frei-Stolba, op. cit. (above n. 23): 28ff. & nn. There may be a slight attack on Hadrian and his religious policy in this passage of Suetonius, if the life of Gaius was composed after Suetonius' dismissal--but this is only conjecture. For other instances, perhaps, of oblique references to Hadrian, see G. Townend, The date of composition of Suetonius' Caesares, CQ 53 (1959) 284-293. On the chronology of Suetonius' work, in addition to the references in Chapter 5 n. 20, see G.W. Bowersock, Suetonius and Trajan, Hommages à Marcel Renard, Collection Latomus, 1, Brussels (1969): 119-125, where it is stated that Suetonius "composed the lives of the Caesars from Galba to Domitian before those of the Julio-Claudians and in the reign of Trajan." This suggestion was refuted by K.R. Bradley, The composition of Suetonius' Caesares again, Journal of Indo-European Studies 1 (1973): 257-263. CIL VI 207 has been dated tentatively to A.D. 118. Thus, the use of the formula "optimus maximusque princeps" would have been well known to Suetonius.

25. It is noteworthy that the name "Caesar" did not become part of an imperial formula until the accession of Claudius. Thus, whereas the designation "optimus maximusque princeps" was clearly rooted in imperial formula, the name allegedly

assumed by Gaius had no basis in imperial nomenclature and can only indicate Gaius' rivalry with the god, Iuppiter O.M. On the name and title "Caesar" see L. Lesuisse, Le titre de Caesar et son evolution au cours de l'histoire de l'empire, LEC 29 (1961): 271-287.

26. H.G. Niemeyer, Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser, Monumenta Artis Romanae, 7, Berlin (1968): 36; cf. Eitrem, op. cit. (above n. 1): 53.

27. On the informality of this address, see also Eitrem, op. cit. (above n. 1): 54. On the irony that may be implicit, see, for example, TLL V, Pt. 2, 891. 6.

28. Gaius, according to Dio 60. 4. 5-6, does not appear to have suffered "damnatio memoriae" after his death. His acts, however, were rescinded and his images pulled down at night. We should not, therefore, expect to find any documents in which he named himself

Iuppiter. On Claudius' treatment of his nephew, see also Suet. *Claud*. 11. 3.

29. Suet. *Gaius* 21; cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 7 (1949): 206-238 *in* E.M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*, Cambridge (1967): 48, no. 127.

30. H. Willrich, Caligula, *Klio* 3 (1903): 445, n. 5.

31. Compare the account of this dream of Gaius with that of his namesake Caesar in Suet. *Iul*. 81. 3.

32. Niemeyer, *op. cit*. (above n. 26): 106. Niemeyer demonstrates convincingly that the representation of the emperor in the guise of Iuppiter is to be considered as part of the "unofficial" court propaganda from the time of Augustus, 59ff., especially, 60. Cf. Ward, *op. cit*. (above n. 12): 220f. There is the possibility, therefore, that the statue of Zeus Olympios and the statue (?) of Gaius

standing between the Dioscuri (it is mentioned in the same sentence as the former statue) have been misrepresented by our ancient sources in much the same way that the dinner party in which Augustus appeared "pro Apolline ornatus" (Suet. Aug. 70) was misrepresented by pro-Antonian propaganda (cf. Niemeyer, op. cit., 54, n. 452 and the authorities cited there). If this is the case, we may see that an "Angleichung an Iuppiter" was the norm for an emperor in the first century after Christ and, therefore, it is even more unlikely that such an identification would have been the basis for a charge of impiety or blasphemy against Gaius.

33. Cf. Horace Car. 3. 5. 1ff.: "Caelo tonantem ...."

34. For a brief chronology, see D. Fishwick, The annexation of Mauretania, Historia 20 (1971): 467ff.; also, above Chapter 6, n. 27 and the authorities cited there.

Cf. Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 96, and, Notes concerning the principate of Gaius, *JRS* 24 (1934): 21. Suet. *Gaius* 49. 2: "*atque omisso vel dilato triumpho ovans urbem natali suo ingressus est*."

35. I am not concerned here with the alleged impersonations of deities by Gaius nor with the "proskynesis" introduced by L. Vitellius on his recall from Syria which was obviously informal (Suet. *Vit*. 2. 5; Dio 59. 27. 5). The date for Vitellius' return to Rome is uncertain; see, for a review of the modern authorities, A. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines. A History of the Roman Empire, A.D. 14-192*, trans. J.R. Foster, London (1974): 582ff.

36. Suet. *Claud*. 9. 2: "*postremo sestertium octogies pro introitu novi sacerdotii coactus impendere, ad eas rei familiaris angustias decidit, ut cum obligatam aerario fidem liberare non posset, in vacuum lege praediatoria venalis*

pependerit sub edicto praefectorum." (On which see H. Smilda, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii*, Diss. Groningen (1896): 36ff. According to Dio 59. 28. 5, the cost of joining the priesthood was ten million sesterces.

37. For the bridge (did it really exist ?) see Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 174; S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London (1927): 399.

38. M. Gelzer, *RE* 10: 410; Willrich, *op. cit*. (above n. 30): 445ff.; Garzetti, *op. cit*. (above n. 35): 100; Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 162ff. Nock, *CAH* 10 (1934): 496f. also believed in the existence of two temples.

39. Eitrem, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 54f.; Gagé, *op. cit*. (above n. 7): 73, n. 110.

40. Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 162, 166.

41. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* ^{2}, Munich (1912); Latte, *op. cit*. (above n. 2).

42. See above n. 8; Townend, op. cit. (above n. 4), and, Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius, and Pliny, Hermes 89 (1961): 227-248.

43. For example, the challenge issued to Iuppiter and the reconstruction of the Didymeion at Miletus.

44. For example, see above n. 43.

45. Above p. 132.

46. Cf. Smallwood, op. cit. (above n. 29): 50 (ILS 5025); below n. 67, Tacitus Ann. 15. 74.

47. See Smilda, op. cit. (above n. 36): 36. Th. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht ^{3}, I, Leipzig (1887): 352, suggested that the priesthood was modelled after the "Augustales" and that the priests of Gaius' cult had the same name. Smilda, loc. cit., rejected the suggestion on the ground that Gaius was worshipped as Iuppiter. Mommsen's suggestion is credible. The fact that the candidates for the "novum sacerdotium" had to pay

for the privilege and that Claudius had to borrow money from the Aerarium is, in my opinion, a further indication that the cult was formally established.

48. Eitrem, *op. cit*. (above n. 1): 54f.

49. Cf. *IG* VII 2711; Suet. *Aug*. 52, *Tib*. 26.

50. See above nn. 38, 39, 40.

51. Cf. R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*, Teil 2, Band 1, Hannover and Leipzig (1898): 287; E. Schwyzer and A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, Band 2, *Syntax und syntactische Stylistik*, Munich (1950): 616-619. Cf. Thucydides 6. 100. 1; Plato *Laws* 838a, *Phaedrus* 255c.

52. On the atticism "νεὼν" see W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, Stuttgart (1887), reprint Hildesheim (1964), I: 226, III:25, IV: 20, 582. On the use of the word "κατάλυσις," see *LSJM*^{9} (1940): 899 and U.P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani*

Historiarum Romanorum Quae Supersunt, Volume 5, *Index Graecitatis*, reprint Zurich (1969): *ad loc*.

53. This, perhaps, may be taken to be an indication of identification with Iuppiter. However, it is clear from Suetonius' account that the biographer considered Gaius' acquiescence to be reluctant. It is notable also that Dio (59. 28. 3) inverts the relative chronology of Suetonius' account and suggests that Gaius first installed himself on the Capitol and then "ἀπαξιώσας δὲ δὴ τὰ δευτερεῖα ἐν τῇ συνοικήσει αὐτοῦ φέρεσθαι, καὶ προσεγκαλέσας οἱ ὅτι τὸ Καπιτώλιον προκατέλαβεν, οὕτω δὴ ἕτερόν τε νεων ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ σπουδῇ ᾠκοδομήσατο." Dio's account, therefore, demonstrates once again Gaius' reluctance to be considered inferior to Iuppiter--according to our ancient sources--and his desire to compete with the god.

54. Cf., for example, Suet. *Aug*. 45. 4,

Gaius 41. 2, *Nero* 31. 1. Suetonius also uses the word "*domus*" to mean a person's "*res familiaris*" or members of an individual's family, cf. *Aug*. 65. 1, *Gaius* 13. For further examples, consult A.A. Howard and C.N. Jackson, *Index Verborum C. Suetoni Tranquilli Stilique eius Proprietatum nonnullarum*, Cambridge, Mass. (1922), reprint Hildesheim (1963): 75f.

55. See above n. 52; *TLL* IV: 791ff.

56. At least, that is the inference to be drawn from the ancient sources. See, however, n. 32.

57. Balsdon, *op. cit*. (above n. 4): 167; cf. above n. 28.

58. Josephus *AJ* 19. 87 tells us that it was an Asprenas and not Gaius who was splashed with the blood of the sacrificial victim and that the sacrifice was to "Augustus Caesar."

59. Cf. *Nero* 56, *Aug*. 70. 1.

60. See above n. 49.

61. See D.M. Pippidi, La date de l'*Ara Numinis Augusti* de Rome, *REL* 11 (1933): 435-456; L.R. Taylor, Tiberius' *Ovatio* and the *Ara Numinis Augusti*, *AJP* 58 (1937): 185-193. On the question raised by, among others, Taylor (189ff.) about the relationship between "*numen Augusti*" and "*numen Augustum*" see, especially, D. Fishwick, *GENIUS* and *NUMEN*, *HThR* 62 (1969): 366f. where it is suggested that "it is preferable to take *numen Augustum* simply as a variant on *numen Augusti*, with which it is therefore theologically identical."

62. See above n. 61, Fishwick, *op. cit.*, 356ff. and the authorities cited there. Fishwick sees a theological distinction between the "*numen*" of the emperor and the emperor's "*genius*," and in doing so opposes D.M. Pippidi, Le "Numen Augusti," *REL* 9 (1931): 83-111. In this Fishwick must be correct. However, as he observes (see also *Phoenix* 31 [1977]: 285, n. 1

contra D. Hennig, L. Aelius Seianus, Untersuchungen zur Regierung des Tiberius, Vestigia, Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte 21, Munich [1975]: 125f., n. 20), "to use numen of the genius Augusti is both normal and acceptable." On the relevance of this to Gaius, see below n. 69. On the distinction between possessing "numen" and being a "numen" which may have been hard to grasp for normal people, see also Fishwick, op. cit., 365.

63. For Augustus, see above n. 12 and the authorities cited there. For Tiberius, see CIL II 49 (Lusitania) and for his connection with the Dioscuri at Tusculum, G. McCracken, Tiberius and the cult of the Dioscuri at Tusculum, CJ 25 (1940): 486-488. For the younger Drusus and Germanicus, see V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius ^{2}, Oxford (1955): 95, n. 130a.

64. Cf. Ovid *Fasti* 3. 421. See, especially, Ward, *op. cit*. (above n. 12): 203-212.

65. Scribonius Largus *Praef*., 60 (cf. M.P. Charlesworth, Deus Noster Caesar, *CR* 39 [1925]: 113-115); Seneca *Consol. ad Polyb*. 12. 3, 13. 2 ("*divina manus*").

66. *CIL* IV 3882, 3884 (Pompeii), also, from Nero's reign, *CIL* IV 1185. See Latte, *op. cit*. (above n. 2): 319f. & n.

67. Tacitus *Ann*. 15. 74. Tacitus states that he discovered this proposal of C. Anicius Cerealis "*in commentariis senatus*." See D. Fishwick, Tacitean usage and the temple of Divus Claudius, *Britannia* 4 (1973): 264f.

68. E. Köberlein, *Caligula und die ägyptischen Kulte*, Meisenham am Glan (1962): 47ff.

69. Firstly, there is the possibility that the cult was dedicated (or constituted) not to Gaius' "*numen*" but to the "*genius*" of the emperor. As Fishwick has observed, *loc. cit*. (above nn. 61, 62), ever since the time of Augustus writers used "*numen*"

in a developed sense for "divinity." Ovid refers to the "numina trina" (comprising the Lares and Augustus' "genius") in *Fasti* 5. 145f. Horace, *Car*. 4. 5. 33f. also refers to the "numen" of Augustus when the reference should be to his "genius." This latter reference is particularly interesting because the same apparent mistake is made in *Ep*. 2. 1. 15f. (though on this see Hennig, *op. cit*. [above n. 62]: 124ff.), probably written in 12 B.C. at the time of the institution of the cult of the emperor's "genius" (see Latte, *op. cit*. [above n. 2]: 306ff.). On the use of "numen" for "genius" see Pippidi, *op. cit*. (above n. 61) and F. Bömer, Der Eid beim Genius des Kaisers, *Athenaeum* 44 (1966): 111, n. 81 and the authorities cited there. If Suetonius, then, has here confused "genius" and "numen", it may be that the "simulacrum ... aureum iconicum" was really the "genius principis" (cf. Suet. *Vit*. 2. 5 where Narcissus and

Pallas are placed among the Lares. They were not deified. On the question of statuary associated with the "genius" of the emperor see Niemeyer, op. cit. (above n. 26): 44ff. There is no real reason to suppose that because a statue was of precious metal, silver or gold, it therefore signified deification (contra K. Scott, The significance of statues in precious metals in emperor worship, TAPA 52 (1931): 101-123), even though frowned upon by Augustus and Tiberius (see above n. 49).

Secondly, it must not be forgotten that Nero, who later rejected divine honours (see above n. 67), was decreed a life-sized statue by the Senate at the time of his accession which was placed in the temple of Mars Ultor. (See A.D. Nock, Σύνναος θεός, HThR 41 (1948): 1-62).

Thirdly, Suetonius' description, "simulacrum ... aureum iconicum", is in itself unusual. The biographer regularly uses the word "*simulacrum*" to indicate a cult statue (cf. *Gaius* 22. 2, *Aug*. 57. 1, *Tib*. 26; though see *Aug*. 96. 2). The adjective "*iconicum*", however, is derived from the Greek "ἐικων" which was used to refer to the emperor's "*imago*" as opposed to an "ἄγαλμα" or "*simulacrum*" (cf. M.P. Charlesworth, Some observations on ruler-cult especially in Rome, *HThR* 28 (1935): 32, n. 77). The word "*iconicus*" is also quite rare and, according to *TLL* VII 1. 2: 162, only used on two other occasions by Pliny the Elder. It is possible, therefore, that Suetonius employed a Greek source for this anecdote and that the source (Balbillus [?], see above n. 8) referred not to a "*simulacrum*" but an "ἐικων" or "*imago*"--that is, the emperor's image which was sometimes placed beside the cult statues of gods in temples (cf. in addition to the case of Nero cited above, Suet. *Tib*. 26 [below, p. 148] and, for Trajan, Pliny *Ep. ad Traianum* 96).

It is noteworthy that Dio does not place the "ἔικων" in a temple associated with the cult of Gaius, but in a different context (Dio 59. 16. 10; cf. Weinstock, *op. cit*. [above n. 1]: 241, where it is suggested that the golden image was associated with honor of Gaius' *Clementia*). It is also noteworthy that the golden "ἔικων" of Dio 59. 16. 10 was voted to Gaius by the Senate. (For an alternative proposal concerning the statue, see Köberlein, *op. cit*. [above n. 68]: 44ff.) (On the cult of Gaius' "*genius*" as an imitation of Caesar, see Weinstock, *op. cit*. [above n. 1]: 213ff.)

70. Dio 59. 29. 7. On the possibility that the temple associated with the cult was not completed, see above n. 2. In this chapter I have attempted to confine my inquiry to two quite specific issues; namely the identification of Gaius with Iuppiter and the cult established in A.D. 40. When the evidence for Gaius'

aberrations is viewed *en masse*, however, there can be little doubt but that the emperor aimed at a rule more absolute than those of his predecessors. It is, as Weinstock suggests, quite likely that Gaius consciously imitated the actions of the dictator Caesar. To my mind, however, the question regarding Caesar's divine aspirations is still open and should not be solved by an appeal to the actions of Gaius. Also, it was not the purpose of this chapter to review the evidence for Gaius' attempts at monarchy, perhaps "oriental" in nature. On this, consult Köberlein, *op. cit.* (above n. 68), but, for a less extreme and much more convincing viewpoint, see P. Ceauşescu, Caligula et le legs d' Auguste, *Historia* 22 (1973): 269-283, where it is suggested that Gaius rejected the "*politique réligieuse*" of Augustus not to dishonor Augustus but to rehabilitate the memory of his grandfather M. Antonius,

thereby reconciling and representing "toutes les tendances politiques de l'Empire" (279). However, "la réaction idéologique de la fraction intéressée au maintien de la formule augustéenne s'est manifestée dans l'oeuvre de Suetone, a été embrassée par Dion Cassius et enfin a été reprise, pour d'autres raisons, par Philon d'Alexandrie et Flavius Josèphe" (283).

*An earlier, and much shorter version of the ideas presented here was delivered in February 1978 at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Canadian West in Calgary. An amended version was delivered also at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in June 1978 at London, Ontario.

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	L'Antiquité Classique
AFLF	Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Napoli
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJP	American Journal of Philology
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin (1972-)
Athenaeum	Athenaeum. Studi periodici di Letteratura e Storia dell' Antichita
Att. Accad. Sc. Ist. Bologna	Atti della Accademia di Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. Classe di Scienze morali. Rendiconti
Ber. d. sächs. Gesellsch.	Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften
BpW	Berlin philologische Wochenschrift

Britannia	Britannia. A Journal of Romano-British and Kindred Studies
BSAF	Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
CP	Classical Philology
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CR	Classical Review
Gallia	Gallia. Fouilles et Monuments archéologiques en France métropolitaine
Gnomon	Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft
Hellenica	'Ελληνικά. Φιλολ., ἱστορ., καὶ λάογρ. Περιοδικὸν Σύγγραμμα τῆς 'Εταιρείας Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν
Hermes	Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie
Historia	Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte
HThR	Harvard Theological Review
ILS	Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae,

	ed. H. Dessau, Berlin (1892-1916)
Iura	Iura. Rivista internazionale di Diritto romano e antico
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
Klio	Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte
Latomus	Latomus. Revue Belge d'Études Latines
LEC	Les Études Classiques
LSJM	A Greek-English Lexicon ^{9}, compiled by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, ed. H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie, Oxford (1940)
MH	Museum Helveticum. Revue Suisse pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité classique
OGI	Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger, Leipzig (1903-05)
Opuscula Romana	Opuscula Romana. Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae
Phoenix	Phoenix. The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada
PIR	Prosopographia Imperii Romani ^{2}, ed. E. Groag, A. Stein, et al.,

	Berlin/Leipzig (1933-)
PP	La Parola del Passato. Rivista di Studi antichi
RAL	Rendiconti della Classe morali, storiche e filologiche dell' Accademia Lincei
RBPhH	Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire
RE	Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung begonnen von G. Wissowa, Stuttgart (1894-)
RH	Revue Historique
SMSR	Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni
Soc. Scient. Fenn. Comm. Hum. Litt.	Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae
Symbolae Osloenses	Symbolae Osloenses, auspiciis Societatis Graeco-Latinae
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association

TLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
WS	Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie und Patristik
YCS	Yale Classical Studies

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aalders, G.J.D., *Caligula, zoon van Germanicus*, Aasen (1959)

Ailloud, H., *Suétone. Vie des douze Césars* ^{4}, Vols. 1-3, Paris (1967)

D'Anna, G., *Le idee letterarie di Suetonio*, Florence (1967)

D'Anto, V., Sviste ed errori nei date cronologici di Suetonio e di altri biografi minori, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia*, Naples, 7 (1957): 117-143

Astin, A.E., "Nominare" in accounts of elections in the early Principate, *Latomus* 28 (1969): 863-874

Audin, A., and P. Quoniam, Victoires et colonnes de l'autel fédéral des Trois Gaules: données nouvelles, *Gallia* 20 (1962): 103-116

Balsdon, J.P.V.D., Notes concerning the Principate of Gaius, *JRS* 24 (1934): 13-24

-------, *The Emperor Gaius*, Oxford (1934)

Bardon, H., *Les Empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien*, Paris (1940)

Barnes, T.D., The victories of Augustus, *JRS* 64 (1974): 21-26

Bassols de Climent, M., *C. Suetonio Tranquilo. Vida de los doce Césares*, Barcelona (1964)

Béranger, J., La démocratie sous l'empire romain; les opérations éléctorales de la Tabula Hebana et la destinatio, *MH* 14 (1957): 216-240

Bergener, A., *Die führende Senatorenschicht im frühen Prinzipat (14-68 n. Chr.)*, Diss. Bonn (1965)

Bicknell, P., The emperor Gaius' military activities in A.D. 40, *Historia* 17 (1968): 496-505

Birt, Th., *Pontifex* und *sexagenarii de ponte*, *RhM* 75 (1926): 115-127

Boissevain, U.P., *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanorum Quae Supersunt*, Vols. 1-5, reprint Zurich (1969)

Bömer, F., Der Eid beim Genius des Kaisers, *Athenaeum* 44 (1966): 77-133

Bowersock, G.W., Suetonius and Trajan, *Hommages* à Marcel Renard, Collection Latomus, 1, Brussels (1969): 119-125

Bradley, K.R., The composition of Suetonius' Caesares again, Journal of Indo-European Studies 1 (1973): 257-263

Broughton, T.R.S., The Magistrates of the Roman Republic, Vol. 2, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, 15, 2, Cleveland (1952)

Brunt, P.A., The Lex Valeria Cornelia, JRS 51 (1961): 71-83

-------, and J.M. Moore, Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus, Oxford (1967)

Carcopino, J., Précisions chronologiques relatives au mariage d'Octave et de Livie, BSAF (8 May 1929): 147-148

-------, Le mariage d'Octave et de Livie et la naissance de Drusus, RH 161 (1929): 225-236

Ceauşescu, P., Caligula et le legs d'Auguste, Historia 22 (1973): 269-283

Charlesworth, M.P., Deus Noster Caesar, CR 39 (1925): 113-115

-------, Some observations on ruler-cult especially in Rome, HThR 28 (1935): 5-44

-------, Five Men. Character Studies from the Roman Empire, Cambridge, Mass., (1936)

Christ, K., Drusus und Germanicus. Der Eintritt der Römer in Germanien, Paderborn (1956)

Clarke, G.W., The Destinatio centuries in A.D. 14, Historia 13 (1964): 383-384

Coli, U., Nuove osservazioni e congetture sulla "tabula Hebana," Iura 3 (1952): 90-131

della Corte, F., Lingua e cultura nella Tabula Hebana, PP 14 (1950): 109-117

-------, Suetonio eques Romanus, Milan (1958)

Crawford, M.H., Roman Republican Coinage, Vols. 1-2, Cambridge (1974)

Davies, R.W., The abortive invasion of Britain by Gaius, Historia 15 (1966): 124-128

Degrassi, A., I Fasti consolari dell'impero romano dal 30 av. Cr. al 613 d. Cr., Rome (1952)

Deininger, J., Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit, Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, 6, Munich (1965)

Dorey, T.A., Adultery and propaganda in the early Roman empire, *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 8, 1 (1961): 1-6

Ehrenberg, V., and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* ^{2}, Oxford (1955)

Eitrem, S., Zur Apotheose, *Symbolae Osloenses* 10 (1932): 31-56; 11: 11-34

Enghofer, R., *Der Ablativus Absolutus bei Tacitus*, Diss. Juilius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg (1961)

Faur, J.C., La première conspiration contre Caligula, *RBPhH* 51 (1953): 13-50

Feldman, L.H., The sources of Josephus "Antiquities" Book 19, *Latomus* 21 (1962): 320-333

Ferrero, G., *Les Femmes des Césars*, Paris (1911)

Fink, R.O., A.S. Hoey, and W.F. Snyder, *The Feriale Duranum*, *YCS* 7 (1940): 1-221

Fisher, C.D., *Cornelii Taciti Annalium ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri*, Oxford (1906)

Fishwick, D., *GENIUS* and *NUMEN*, *HThR* 62 (1969): 356-367

-------, The annexation of Mauretania, *Historia* 20 (1971): 467-487

-------, The temple of the Three Gauls, *JRS* 62 (1972): 46-52

-------, Templum Divo Claudio Constitutum, *Britannia* 3 (1972): 164-181

-------, Tacitean usage and the temple of *Divus Claudius*, *Britannia* 4 (1973): 264-265

-------, The Severi and the provincial cult of the Three Gauls, *Historia* 22 (1973): 627-649

-------, and B.D. Shaw, Ptolemy of Mauretania and the conspiracy of Gaetulicus, *Historia* 25 (1976): 490-494

-------, review of HENNIG, *Phoenix* 31 (1977): 284-286

-------, The development of ruler worship in the western Roman empire, *ANRW* II. 16, 2 (in press)

Fitzler, K., and O. Seeck, Iulius (132), *RE* 10 (1917): 275-381

Fraenkel, E., *Horace*, Oxford (1957)

Frank, T., Claudius and the Pavian Inscription, *CQ* n.s. 2 (1908): 89-92

Franke, C., Fasti Horatiani, Berlin (1839) [non vidi]

Frazer, J.G., Ovid's Fasti, London (1931)

Frei-Stolba, R., Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Zurich (1967)

-------, Inoffizielle Kaisertitulaturen im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr., MH 26 (1969): 18-39

Funaioli, G., Suetonius (4), RE II, 4 (1931): 593-641

Gagé, J., "Basiléia" Les Césars, les Rois d'Orient et les "Mages", Collection d'Etudes Anciennes, Paris (1968)

Gardthausen, V., Augustus und seine Zeit, Teil 1, Band 1, Leipzig (1896), reprint Stuttgart (1964)

-------, Die Namen des späteren Kaisers Claudius, BpW 40 (1908): 1263-1264

Garzetti, A., From Tiberius to the Antonines. A History of the Roman Empire, A.D. 14-192, trans. J.R. Foster, London (1974)

Gatti, C., Gli honores postumi a Germanico, PP 14 (1950): 151-157

Geer, R.M., Notes on the early life of Nero, *TAPA* 63 (1931): 59-61

Gelzer, M., Iulius (133), *RE* 10 (1917): 381-423

-------, Zur neuen Germanicus-Inschrift, *Festschrift für R. Egger*, Vol. 1, Klagenfurt (1952): 84-90

-------, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 2, Wiesbaden (1962)

Goodyear, F.R.D., *The Annals of Tacitus. Books 1-6*, Vols. 1-2, Cambridge (1972)

Grant, M., *Roman Anniversary Issues*, Cambridge (1950)

-------, *Roman Imperial Money*, London (1954)

-------, review of SMITH, *CR* n.s. 5 (1955): 187-189

Groag, E., Claudius (256), *RE* 3 (1899): 2778-2839

Guiraud, P., *Les assemblées provinciales dans l'empire romaine*, Paris (1887)

Gugel, H., *Studien zur biographischen Technik Suetons*, *WS*, Beiheft 7, Vienna (1977)

Hammond, M., *The Antonine Monarchy*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 19, Rome (1959)

Hanell, K., Das Opfer des Augustus an der Ara Pacis, *Opuscula Romana* 2 (1960): 33-123

Hanslik, R., Vibius (49), *RE* II, 8 (1958): 1981-1982

Heinen, H., Zur Begründung des römischen Kaiserkultes, von 48 v. bis 14 n. Chr., Klio 11 (1911): 129-177

Hennig, D., L. Aelius Seianus. Untersuchungen zur Regierung des Tiberius, Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, 21, Munich (1975)

Henzen, W., Acta Fratrum Arvalium Quae Supersunt, Berlin (1874)

Hohl, E., Wann hat Tiberius das Prinzipat übernommen ?, Hermes 68 (1933): 106-115

Holmes, T.R., The Architect of the Roman Empire, Vols. 1-2, Oxford (1928-31)

Howard, A.A., and C.N. Jackson, Index Verborum C. Suetoni Tranquilli Stilique eius Proprietatum nonnullarum, Cambridge, Mass., (1922), reprint Hildesheim (1963)

Ihm, M., C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera, Vol. 1, De Vita Caesarum Libri, Leipzig (1908), reprint Stuttgart (1958)

Instinsky, H.U., Augustus und die Adoption des Tiberius, Hermes 94 (1966): 323-343

Jones, A.H.M., The elections under Augustus, JRS 45 (1955): 9-21

Jullien, C., *Histoire de la Gaule*, Vol. 4 ^{2}, Paris (1921)

Kajanto, I., *The Latin Cognomina*, Soc. Scient. Fenn. Comm. Hum. Litt. 36, 2, Helsinki (1965)

Kempf, C., *Valerius Maximus* ^{2}, Leipzig (1888), reprint Stuttgart (1966)

Khan, H.A., Image and symbol in Catullus 17, *CP* 64 (1969): 88-97

Kneissl, P., *Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser*, Hypomnemata, 23, Gottingen (1969)

Köberlein, E., *Caligula und die ägyptischen Kulte*, Meisenham-am-Glan (1962)

Koestermann, E., *Cornelius Tacitus, Annalen*, Vols. 1-4, Heidelberg (1963-68)

Kornemann, E., Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte, *Klio* 1 (1901): 51-146

-------, *Doppelprinzipat und Reichstellung im Imperium Romanum*, Leipzig/Berlin (1930)

Kraft, K., Der politische Hintergrund von Senecas Apocolocyntosis, *Historia* 15 (1966): 96-122

Krauss, Th., Mars Ultor, Münzbild und Kultbild,

not associated in the "nefaria consilia" attributed to Gaetulicus.

So much, then, for the evidence that Lepidus conspired against Gaius in A.D. 39. The evidence for Gaetulicus' association in such a conspiracy, on the other hand, at first sight appears much stronger. Not only do we possess the solitary mention in Suetonius Claud. 9. 1, we are also fortunate to have the contemporary record of the Arval Brethren "ob detecta nefaria consilia ..." and the knowledge that Sabinus, who may have been a brother-in-law to Gaetulicus, was recalled from Pannonia and subsequently committed suicide (Dio 59. 18. 4). The fact that Sabinus was recalled, however, does not yield any evidence for his complicity in a plot against the emperor. Sabinus may have committed suicide, but there is no evidence at all that L. Apronius, legate of Lower Germany, was removed in a similar fashion--even though we have the explicit testimony of Tacitus that Gaetulicus himself was popular even among the troops commanded by his father-in-law. [29] Similarly, another of Gaetulicus' brothers-in-law,

L. Apronius Caesianus, was consul for the first six months of A.D. 39 and certainly escaped the censure of his colleague Gaius, even though he was in a position better than most to further the aims of the alleged conspirators.[30] Hardly evidence of "un véritable complot, ayant des ramifications dans les divers groupes sociaux du monde impérial, ..." as Faur would have us believe.[31]

In fact, apart from the "nefaria consilia" of the AFA--not incontrovertible evidence for complicity in a plot[32]--Gaetulicus' chief claim to notoriety in antiquity appears to have been his management of the army in Upper Germany and his use of that province almost as his private reserve. According to Tacitus, in his discussion of the events of A.D. 34 (Ann. 6. 30) "Gaetulicus ea tempestate superioris Germaniae legiones curabat mirumque amorem adsecutus erat, effusae clementiae, modicus severitate et proximo quoque exercitui per L. Apronium socerum non ingratus. unde fama constans ausum mittere ad Caesarem litteras, ... sibi fidem integram et, si nullis insidiis peteretur, mansuram; successorem non aliter *quam indicium mortis accepturum. firmarent velut foedus, quo princeps ceterarum rerum poteretur, ipse provinciam retineret*."

The popularity which Gaetulicus enjoyed among his troops in this passage of Tacitus refers, of course, to a time while Tiberius was yet alive. What, then, was the state of the legate's generalship under Gaius ? Here, because of the unfortunate lacuna in Tacitus' work, we are compelled to rely on the evidence of Suetonius and Dio. According to Dio (59. 22. 5) Gaius' overt reason for executing Gaetulicus was that this legate was too popular with his troops after his prolonged tenure of Upper Germany. This statement lies in remarkably close agreement with the passage of Tacitus cited above. Similarly, Suetonius, in his biography of the emperor Galba--Gaetulicus' immediate successor as legate of Upper Germany--records that there was little evidence of a rigorous military discipline when Galba took up command: (*Galba* 6. 2f.) "*disce miles militare: Galba est, non Gaetulicus*." Indeed, according to the biographer, when Gaius arrived in Germany--presumably at the double legionary fortress at Mainz[33]--he appears to have found the commanders and the senior "non-commissioned" officers failing in the performance of their duties (Gaius 44. 1).

Furthermore, again from Suetonius' account (Galba 6. 3), the army of Upper Germany seems to have been singularly ineffective in controlling the movements of "free" Germans at the time of Gaetulicus' removal and the appointment of Galba: there were incursions of barbarians "qui iam in Galliam usque proruperunt." A statement that is not only supported by Dio (59. 21. 2), who gives the hostility of the Germans as Gaius' overt reason for his journey north, but also by the archaeological evidence for the occupation of Upper Germany at about this same time. According to Schönberger, little had been done prior to Claudius' reign in extending the presence of the Roman armies beyond Mainz.[34] Also, and perhaps more significant, there are indications that settlers of Germanic origin established themselves in Upper Germany during this period, in some cases quite close to sites presumably under the control of the Roman army. For Nierhaus, the presence of such settlers in such close proximity to Roman garrisons may only be explained by the hypothesis that they formed detachments of a native militia which, in return for their services in protecting the frontiers, were allowed land on which to settle.[35] Given the well known laxity of the long-time legate, however, such a situation could well have arisen from his failure to supervise closely the affairs of his province. In this regard it is important to note Tacitus' statement that Gaetulicus and Tiberius "*firmarent velut foedus, quo princeps ceterarum rerum poteretur, ipse* [Gaetulicus] *provinciam retineret*," and that Gaetulicus would have regarded the appointment of a successor as an "*indicium mortis*." From the evidence of Tacitus, at any rate, it appears probable that the central administration at Rome did little to regulate the affairs of Upper Germany or the actions of its legate so long as Gaetulicus was in command.

So much for the evidence concerning Gaetulicus. It is eminently clear from the sources reviewed above, which constitute all the references to Lepidus and Gaetulicus that are concerned with the "conspiracy" itself, that there is no mention of a plot in which these two men, Agrippina, and Iulia Livilla took part. Furthermore, there is no ancient evidence that links the erstwhile legate of Pannonia, C. Calvisius Sabinus, or the unknown suffecti of A.D. 39 with the supposed plot.

In fact, the evidence we now possess for the existence of the "conspiracy" is extremely slender and, for the association of Lepidus and Gaetulicus in the same plot, is to be found solely in Suetonius' biography of Claudius. In a biography, that is, whose principal purpose at this point at least was not to record in detail the events of Gaius' reign, but rather to show how Claudius was mistreated by his nephew. In the biography of Gaius--where one might have expected a more detailed treatment of the affair--there is no mention of such a widespread plot. The information contained in that biography, however--as well as that of Galba--agrees very closely with the evidence supplied by Tacitus, Dio, and Rutilius

Namatianus, where the topics of Gaetulicus' incompetence and Lepidus' adultery are mentioned with some force. If Suetonius had evidence of a plot that comprised Gaetulicus, Lepidus, Agrippina, and Iulia Livilla against Gaius in A.D. 39, why should he have employed such evidence only in his composition of the life of Claudius, and not where it would have been utilized more appropriately, in his biography of Gaius ? There is, after all, some evidence to suggest that data for these two lives were compiled at about the same time. [36] In any case, there are no a priori grounds for assuming that the evidence available to the biographer in his composition of the life of Claudius differed markedly from that which was available to him when he wrote the life of Gaius. [37]

III

Other possible interpretations of the "conspiracy"

Given the lack of any direct reference to a large scale plot against the emperor Gaius in A.D. 39 in the majority of our sources, and especially in Suetonius' life of Gaius, it is surely legitimate to re-consider, for example, Meise's statement "*dass es eine Verschwörung war, kann kein Zweifel bestehen*."[38] The motives attributed to the alleged conspirators by recent scholars and which have been mentioned briefly in a note above (p. 75 , n. 2) all support the existence of a conspiracy *prior* to Gaius' excursion to Germany, *only if one assumes in the first place* that such a conspiracy existed. There is no ancient evidence for the reality of such a plot.

Is it possible, then, that no conspiracy existed--even, that is, a conspiracy that was formed after Gaius' arrival in Germany ? To answer such a question there are three major requirements to be fulfilled. Firstly, it is necessary to show that the actions taken by Gaius in A.D. 39, and referred to above (p. 77ff.). may be identified with causes other than conspiracy. Secondly, it is necessary to consider what other plausible reasons lay behind the execution of

Gaetulicus and Lepidus. Thirdly, an attempt must be made to explain how even the very slight references to a conspiracy in A.D 39 came into being.

In A.D. 39 C. Calvisius Sabinus was recalled to Rome and ordered to stand trial on charges that are not mentioned explicitly in our sources. It has been asserted, however, that this man was somehow associated with the alleged conspirators or that he was already engaged in conspiratorial activities. Thus Sabinus' recall has been seen as a part of Gaius' actions in suppressing the alleged conspiracy, inasmuch as, according to Balsdon, it is possible that some senators had already "dreamed of a revolt of Pannonian legions under C. Calvisius Sabinus."[39] A review of the major source for Sabinus' activities at this time, however, suggests an entirely different reason for Sabinus' recall and for his subsequent suicide.

According to that source (Dio 59. 18. 4) Sabinus and his wife Cornelia returned to Rome and were ordered to stand trial on the same charge.[40] It is very possible that the indictments against the legate and his wife were made under the terms of the Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis of 18 B.C. Tacitus (Hist. 1. 48) states that Titus Vinius consorted with Cornelia while he was in Pannonia under the command of Sabinus, for which activity he was indicted and stood trial, "crimen huius reus Titus Vinius arguebatur." As a result of this trial, again according to Tacitus and Plutarch (Galba 12), Titus Vinius was "iussu C. Caesaris oneratus catenis ...." Given the situation, therefore, recorded by Tacitus, that the liaisons of Cornelia and Titus Vinius took place "in ipsis principiis"--the legionary headquarters--it is difficult indeed to accept that these two malefactors were charged under the terms of the Lex Iulia of 18 B.C., while Sabinus himself was to be prosecuted for an entirely unrelated crime. Much more probable is the view that Sabinus was associated in the charges laid against Titus Vinius and his wife. It is apparent from the accounts of Tacitus and Dio that the morale of the Pannonian legions was being threatened by the activities of the legate's wife. There is no reason to suppose that Gaius would have condoned such activities: the fact that he did not is clearly demonstrated by Hist. 1. 48. It is more than likely, therefore, that Sabinus was recalled precisely because of his wife's adultery, which, it appears, he did little to prevent. A husband, who knew of his wife's extra-marital liaisons but who wilfully allowed them to continue, was liable to prosecution under the terms of the Lex Iulia de adulteriis ... as a "leno" or procurer.[41] Thus no evidence here of conspiracy. Sabinus and his wife committed suicide, presumably to avoid the public shame of an open trial in which Cornelia's activities and her husband's acquiescence might have been examined in detail. What is important, however, in this entirely unrelated episode, is the fact that Gaius in A.D. 39 was seriously concerned with the morale and effective capability of the army on the Danubian frontier. This is a concern of some significance that will be seen to be relevant to a discussion of the reasons for Gaetulicus' downfall.

Also in this same year the suffecti were dismissed from office early in September.[42] As their dismissal occurred only a short while before Gaius left Rome, it has been suggested--and accepted--that they too were involved in the alleged conspiracy. Indeed, the knowledge that one of them subsequently committed suicide has been held to support the notion of their complicity. Our sources, however, consistently ignore such a possibility and state that they were removed because they failed to celebrate Gaius' birthday with the appropriate vigor. They did, nevertheless, celebrate the anniversary of the victory at Actium (2 September) at which Gaius' most illustrious ancestor was defeated. This celebration of the victory at Actium surely offers us a more convincing reason for the removal of the suffecti: we know from Suetonius (Gaius 23. 1) that Gaius expressly forbade the celebration of "Actiacas Siculasque victorias."[43] Furthermore, there is nothing surprising in a discovery that Gaius might well have dismissed the suffecti for such trivial reasons. In A.D. 37 Claudius was suffect consul for two months, yet even he barely escaped dismissal for what appears to us as a most inconsequential dereliction of duty.[44] In fact, there is nothing in our ancient sources which at this point is inherently implausible, and nothing which permits the prior assumption of conspiracy in order to demonstrate that the suffecti were dismissed because they were conspirators.

It is asserted also to be beyond doubt that Lepidus, Agrippina, and Iulia Livilla accompanied Gaius to Germany so that they might be prevented from causing trouble at Rome during Gaius' absence. Even the composition of the military detachment that formed the escort on this journey is felt somehow to supply evidence that Lepidus and the emperor's sisters were discovered conspirators.[45] Nevertheless, there is surely another explanation that does not depend on the prior assumption that there was a conspiracy at this time. Firstly, it may be considered a most unusual circumstance had Gaius not been accompanied by a military escort wherever he travelled. Secondly, there is evidence which suggests that the emperor had not planned at the outset to journey as far north as Germany, but that the necessity for that excursion occurred after his departure from Rome. According to Suetonius (*Gaius* 43. 1), the emperor had already left the city for Mevania, "*ad visendum nemus flumenque Clitumni*," when he was struck by a desire "*neque ex destinato*" to engage in military operations. Also Dio (59. 21. 2) states that Gaius did not announce his military designs beforehand, but departed "ἐξαίφνης ." If this were the case, there is surely nothing surprising in the fact that Gaius was accompanied by an entourage which included members of the imperial family. Thirdly, even if we accept the dubious proposition that Gaius had intended all along to travel to Germany, there is still no reason to suppose--without evidence--that Lepidus and the imperial sisters were obliged to accompany Gaius because they were known conspirators.

Our sources state that the imperial family was a very close-knit group and that Gaius. Lepidus, Agrippina, and Iulia Livilla were bound to one another by the most intimate of ties. Lepidus appears to have been not only the debaucher of Agrippina and her sister, but also the paramour of Gaius himself. Furthermore, these were not the only people to accompany Gaius. There is evidence that Passienus Crispus, the future husband of Agrippina, together with at least one other of Gaius' favorites, also formed part of the imperial company.[46] Given the composition of the party, therefore, it is not too unlikely that Gaius had some thought for his creature comforts, not only perhaps for the journey itself, but also for his stay away from Rome which in actual fact turned out to be a protracted affair.[47] Here the question that Gaius put to Passienus Crispus while en route and which concerned Crispus' indulgence in incest may have some significance.[48] Of course, that question may well have been apocryphal. Nevertheless, it could be taken perhaps to underline the nature of the journey to Germany which, although speedy, probably took some time to accomplish.[49] The question also may be taken to throw some light on Gaius' anxieties during this journey which, in fact, resulted in the emperor's sisters being exiled for sexual wrongdoing.

Now, the reason for the journey itself, at the very end of the campaigning season, is not too hard to discern. Most scholars, while they recognize that the military situation on the Rhenish frontier was disturbing, tend nevertheless to accept the assertion that the journey was made at this time in order to surprise Gaetulicus before he could make adequate preparations against the emperor.[50] Even those scholars who are not convinced of the reality of the alleged plot suggest that Gaius made this journey as a pre-emptive strike against the legate of Upper Germany because he had become apprehensive of the military power which had accrued to the family of Gaetulicus.[51] Both these suggestions, however, are based on assumptions that have no foundation in the ancient evidence. The first relies exclusively on the notion that Gaetulicus was already involved in conspiratorial activity before Gaius set out from Rome--for which there is no evidence. The second ignores the evidence supplied by Tacitus

Annals 6. 30. Gaetulicus, after all, had been legate of Upper Germany for a decade and, although popular with his troops, had remained quiet in his province without making any attempt whatsoever to obtain the empire for himself or for anyone else. Indeed, the statement that he and Tiberius "firmarent velut foedus" clearly indicates that so long as he remained undisturbed Gaetulicus had no ambition to take on such a heavy responsibility. Furthermore, according to the testimony of Suetonius (Gaius 44. 1), when the emperor arrived in Germany he found that the army was sadly lacking in military discipline. Such maladministration of the army in Upper Germany is hardly consonant with the view that Gaetulicus was deeply committed to a plot to remove the emperor--a plot, that is, that was reaching its final stages and which clearly would have relied heavily on military support, or that Gaius had just cause to fear the military might which was at Gaetulicus' disposal.

There is evidence, on the other hand, that the military situation on the Rhenish frontier was not as secure as it might have been earlier in Gaius' reign. [52] There is evidence also that Gaius, before he left Rome, had instituted a vigorous recruiting campaign. [53] There is also the explicit statement of Dio (59. 21. 2) that Gaius travelled north overtly because of the hostility of the Germans. [54] Such evidence, when coupled with Gaius' apparent concern for the morale and effectiveness of the Danubian legions [55], points overwhelmingly to one conclusion: that Gaius considered that the military situation on the Rhine had deteriorated to such an extent that it even demanded his presence. Barbarians had penetrated the empire "in Galliam usque" (Suet. Galba 6. 3). The military establishment of Upper Germany was in a shambles and the legate almost totally incompetent. In fact, after the removal of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, military discipline had to be restored by a series of forced marches, manoeuvres, and demotions. [56] All this at a time when the very security of the empire was in jeopardy.

Why, then, was Gaetulicus executed and not quietly transferred to some other less exacting commission ? Because of conspiracy ? Perhaps, but Tacitus and Dio surely supply a more cogent reason. Gaetulicus had been legate of Upper Germany for ten years and, presumably, was very much accustomed to independent command. According to Tacitus, he had resisted interference in the management of his province and, as recently as A.D. 34, had made it clear to Tiberius that he would not countenance removal from his command. In fact, again according to Tacitus, Gaetulicus would have considered any attempt to replace him as an "*indicium mortis*." Dio states that the overt cause of Gaetulicus' death was his popularity with the troops under his command--a popularity which, on the basis of Tacitus' account (see above p.86f.), arose from an almost total disregard for the exigencies of military discipline. It is hard to imagine a more cogent reason for Gaetulicus' death, or one which has better support from the ancient evidence. Gaetulicus was an incompetent who would resist any attempt to remove him. Gaius, therefore, took the legate at his word and executed the man who had stated that removal was tantamount to a sentence of death.

If it is possible, then, that Gaetulicus was executed for reasons other than conspiracy and that Gaius' journey north was not made in anticipation of a plot, is it also possible that Lepidus was removed because of crimes that were not essentially political ? Here the answer must be in the affirmative. In antiquity, as we have seen (pp. 82-83), Lepidus was notorious not for complicity in a plot against the emperor--for which Suetonius Claud. 9. 1 is our only source--but for his adulterous association with the emperor's sisters. Indeed, one source actually states that Lepidus was subjected to the kind of death reserved for those who were found guilty of adulterous and incestuous liaisons: "Incesti poenam solvit adulterii." [57] Suetonius also states that there was a "causa Aemilii Lepidi"--presumably posthumous--in which the principal concern was the fact of adultery with the emperor's sisters. [58] Why look further for the cause of Lepidus' death ? Certainly, it is not really legitimate to suppose that the charge of adultery in the imperial household was used merely to cover up more serious allegations of conspiracy. Adultery itself was a serious crime which as we have already noted in the case of Sabinus (p.93f.), was not looked upon lightly by Gaius--at least, that is, when other people were involved. In fact, as one scholar stated recently: "The seduction of a member of the Emperor's family was not merely adultery, but could at times be regarded as treason (maiestas)." [59] Had Gaius' infant daughter already appeared on the scene by the time of Lepidus' execution, such adultery could have had grave consequences for the succession. [60] Furthermore, if the tradition that Gaius also was involved intimately with his surviving sisters is accepted as historically valid, how much more dire for Lepidus was his association with Agrippina and Iulia Livilla ? In such a situation it is most difficult to believe that Gaius would have condoned such an illicit relationship. After Lepidus had been executed, his lover Agrippina was compelled to return to Rome carrying his ashes.

That journey need not have been merely a parody of a similar journey made by Germanicus' wife, but a parody also of the actions of any faithful and loving spouse. The fact that Lepidus was not Agrippina's husband surely brings into sharp relief the nature of his and Agrippina's crime. [61]

Why, then, was Lepidus killed at this moment in Gaius' reign ? The answer to this question, surely, is that Gaius had been unaware previously of Lepidus' close attachment to his sisters. The close and confined nature of the excursion to Germany revealed to Gaius for the first time the manner of Lepidus' association with Agrippina and Iulia Livilla. This suggestion is not based on mere speculation. It was after Gaius' arrival in Germany that he sent his sisters into exile precisely because of this adultery. [62] Furthermore, if we accept the pertinence of the evidence concerning Passienus Crispus (see above p. 99), the context for the removal of Lepidus and his associates becomes even clearer.

There is, therefore, no evidence to support the existence of a conspiracy prior to Gaius' arrival in Germany. There is, however, substantial support for the proposition that Gaetulicus was executed for entirely different reasons--support enhanced by the possibility that in the official record of the Arval Brethren "*ob detecta nefaria consilia in C. Germanicum Cn. Lentuli Gaetulici ...*" there is no room for Lepidus' name.[63]

Even so, can the record of the Arval Brethren for 27 October A.D 39 be taken as positive proof that Gaetulicus had been involved in a plot against the emperor ? Probably not. As Balsdon rightly pointed out, that record "proves no more than Gaius reported that he had escaped from conspiracy."[64] Also, if Gaetulicus was executed for the reasons suggested in this chapter, it is not inconceivable that--if only for propagandist purposes--Gaius would have felt obliged to present a reasonable excuse to the Senate for the legate's abrupt removal.

In this regard, Dio's account is of some significance. The historian states (59. 23. 1) that Gaius sent a report to Rome "ὡς καὶ μεγάλην τινὰ ἐπιβουλὴν διαπεφευγώς ." This statement, by the use of "ὡς" and the participle, clearly suggests that the veracity of such a report may well have been suspect.[65] Also there is evidence of such a suspicion in another of the few sources for the existence of the "conspiracy". It has been suggested that the language of Suetonius' account in *Vesp*. 2. 3 indicates the serious nature of the plot "in fact".[66] Suetonius' account, however, may not support this contention. The biographer states that Vespasian "*praetor infensum senatui Gaium ne quo non genere demereretur, ludos extraordinarios pro victoria depoposcit poenaeque coniuratorum addendum censuit, ut insepulti proicerentur*." The inference to be drawn from this passage, however, is that Vespasian wished to gain favor with Gaius at the expense of the rest of the Senate, to whom the emperor was "*infensum*". A clear indication, surely, that the Senate did not readily accept the truth of Gaius' report from Germany. Given the implied scepticism, therefore, in these two passages of Dio and Suetonius, it is clearly possible that Gaius' contemporaries at

Rome regarded the emperor's report from Germany as a propagandist account of his activities, rather than as an accurate representation of what actually happened. Thus, it is not wholly improbable that Gaius invented the "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" in order to present the Senate at Rome with a reasonable excuse for his removal of the legate of Upper Germany and of the heir apparent, M. Aemilius Lepidus.[67]

Conclusion

There is no direct support for the belief that a "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" was formed prior to Gaius' departure from Rome in September A.D. 39, or that such a "conspiracy" was the prime reason for the emperor's excursion to Germany. There is, on the other hand, substantial support for the proposition that Gaius' sudden departure was the result of a rapidly deteriorating military situation on the Rhenish frontier, which, because of the evident incompetence of the legate of Upper Germany, had posed a severe threat to the security of the empire. Furthermore, there is the strong likelihood that Gaetulicus and Lepidus were not removed for their complicity in a plot to oust Gaius, but for entirely different reasons: utter incompetence and adultery with the emperor's sisters.[68] In addition to this, there is also some slight support for the suggestion that Gaius may have invented the "conspiracy"--or, at least, one which comprised Lepidus and his sisters, Agrippina and Iulia Livilla, whose adulterous association he may have regarded as a "crimen maiestatis".[69]

The report that Gaius sent from Germany after the execution of Lepidus appears not to have been wholely credible to those who remained at Rome. Thus, it is possible that Suetonius was aware of the dubious quality of the report and, as a result, omitted any direct reference to the "conspiracy" in his biography of Gaius. In the life of Claudius, however, the need to represent accurately the events of Gaius' reign was, presumably, less pressing. Here the "conspiracy" of Lepidus and Gaetulicus could be mentioned briefly and then only as a convenient introduction to Gaius' treatment of his uncle.

In this chapter an attempt has been made to re-evaluate the ancient evidence for a "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" directed against Gaius in A.D 39. It is very probable, however, that the suggestions made here may never be capable of positive proof. Nevertheless, from this review of the ancient evidence I believe it is apparent that serious doubts may be cast on the reality of the alleged plot.[70] At any rate, our present understanding of the "Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio" as a long standing conspiracy, which was suppressed largely by Gaius' timely and anticipatory advance to Germany, is certainly open to question. That such a plot existed should not, in any case, be regarded--as it has been--as an established historical fact. *

CHAPTER 6

The Cult of the Emperor Gaius

Of all the charges of aberration and perversion that were levelled against Gaius after his death, of all the examples of madness that are provided for us by our ancient sources, which, when viewed together, form our standard, received picture of the *princeps* as a "*monstrum*," one of the most interesting is the claim that Gaius wished to be thought of as a god and that, to this end, he established a cult of himself at Rome.

In this chapter I propose to survey the ancient evidence for the establishment of the cult in the hope that several useful observations may be made about the extent to which the emperor's aspirations to divinity were gratified. In particular, an attempt will be made to discover whether or not Gaius, for all his extravagant posturing, was worshipped at Rome in the guise of Iuppiter (a suggestion implicit in Weinstock's account of the religious policies of the Romans during and shortly after the time of the dictator Gaius Caesar) and whether or not Gaius received reverence at Rome as a "praesens deus" perhaps, as Eitrem has suggested, with the title "Caesar Optimus Maximus."[1]

I

The sources

Our sources for the divine aspirations of Gaius at Rome are relatively few and are varied in nature and reliability. They are, in rough chronological order: Seneca (*de Ira* 1. 20. 9 and, perhaps, *de Tranquillitate Animi* 14. 9[2]); Philo (*Leg. ad Gaium* 76-113, 346); Flavius Josephus (*AJ* 19. 4, 11); Suetonius (*Gaius* 22, 33, *Claud*. 9. 2); and Cassius Dio (in the epitomes of Xiphilinus and Zonaras, 59. 25-28).[3] Of these sources the first two, Seneca and Philo, were contemporaries of Gaius and thus should be able to provide us with reliable information. Josephus, the third

C

writer listed, is only slightly later in date and may have based his own account--though to what extent we cannot tell--on Philo.[4]

In spite of the contemporaneity or near contemporaneity of these sources, however, they make only the slightest references to a cult of Gaius and, notably, are the most restrained. The last two sources, on the other hand, Suetonius and Dio, were separated from the events they relate by greater distances in time. The early second century biographer gives us more information than Seneca, Philo, or Josephus (for example, he is the first of our sources to mention a temple associated with a cult of Gaius at Rome) and his account is, essentially, less restrained than those of his predecessors. The last of our sources, the third century historian Dio (or his epitomators) yields information about the cult that is at once more lurid and, apparently, more detailed.[5]

Within the accounts of these sources, there are several different topics each concerned with the emperor's aspirations to divine honors. For example, Philo, Suetonius, and Dio each refer to the emperor's penchant for impersonating a variety of deities. Philo's account, however, is unique; for he is the only authority to tell us that Gaius first impersonated demi-gods and minor deities before proceeding to impersonations of the major gods, Ares, Hermes, and Apollo.[6] Also, each of our five sources refers to Gaius' relationship with Iuppiter; though, as we shall see, "_entre les témoignages de Suétone, de Flavius Josephe et de Philon_ [and Seneca and Dio], _il y a des variantes d'affabulation plutôt qu'une divergence de fond_."[7] In addition, the actual establishment of a cult of Gaius at Rome, along with the erection of an associated temple or temples, is only mentioned in our two later sources, Suetonius and Dio. It is possible that, in this regard, Dio has made use of Suetonius' biography of Gaius. It is equally possible, however, that both Suetonius and Dio employed the same or similar sources in the composition of their own works.[8]

Finally, each of the five writers listed above appears to have made use of a tradition that was uniformly hostile toward Gaius. In part, of course, this tradition was formed by the two contemporaries, Seneca and Philo. Seneca survived Gaius' reign, but, if we are to believe him, only narrowly.[9] Philo also had first hand knowledge of the emperor; for, in A.D. 40, he led an Alexandrian embassy to Gaius on behalf of the Jewish community in that city.[10] Neither, however, had any cause to extol the emperor or his virtues. With this in mind, then, we should guard against drawing too definite conclusions about the nature of Gaius' aspirations to divinity or about the nature and function of the cult that was established at Rome.

II

Gaius and Iuppiter

Philo, in his account of the embassy to Gaius, is our only authority for the emperor's progressive impersonations of deities from demi-gods to the major gods Ares, Hermes, and Apollo. Nevertheless, he never suggests that the emperor actually assumed the attributes of Iuppiter or that he impersonated the god. In his only reference to Gaius as Iuppiter (*Leg. ad Gaium* 346) he is concerned not with an identification of Gaius with Iuppiter at Rome but with the proposed re-dedication of the temple at Jerusalem as a temple "Διὸς Ἐπιφανοῦς Νέου ... Γαίου."[11] In the Jewish context, of course, such a proposal was abhorrent and entailed desecration of the temple. In gentile religious practices, however, there was nothing particularly unusual about such an identification of the ruling emperor with Iuppiter or Zeus. Indeed, there were numerous dedications to Augustus as Zeus in the Greek east.[12] Josephus also records Gaius' proposed desecration of the temple at Jerusalem (*AJ* 18. 261-310, *BJ* 2. 184-203) and, although his accounts are not consistent with each other or with Philo's, there is still no indication that the emperor wished to be identified at Rome with Iuppiter.[13] Tacitus too mentions the re-dedication of this temple in a brief notice--his major narrative on the reign of Gaius is, of course, no longer extant. This historian, like Josephus, states that the projected desecration of the temple was arrested by Gaius' death: (Hist. 5. 9) "dein iussi a C. Caesare effigiem eius in templo locare arma potius sumpsere, quem motum Caesaris mors diremit."

These references, then, to a statue to be erected in the temple at Jerusalem are not directly related to the establishment of a cult of Gaius at Rome. They, however, show that Gaius' aspirations to divine honors and his alleged identification with Iuppiter probably occurred late in his reign; for P. Petronius, the legate of Syria who advised the emperor against the desecration of the temple, survived only as a result of the emperor's death.

Here the various accounts of Gaius' desire to remove the statue of Zeus Olympios from its temple and bring it Rome are relevant. This desire is reported by Josephus (AJ 19. 8-10), Suetonius (Gaius 22. 2), and by Dio (59. 28. 3-4). Josephus states that the statue was to be removed but that the work was held up by various portents and by the fact that P. Memmius Regulus, the legate of Achaea, was informed that the statue would suffer damage were it moved. Regulus postponed the work and wrote a letter to Gaius explaining his actions. Like Petronius, Regulus too survived Gaius' anger only as a result of the emperor's demise. In Suetonius' account we are given a similar story but, for the first time, we are told that Gaius wished to replace the head of the famous Iuppiter with his own.[14] The statue, however, according to Suetonius (Gaius 57. 1) emitted peals of laughter, thus portending the emperor's death. Dio repeats the anecdotes concerning the statue's laughter, but states also that the ship sent to transport the statue to Rome was destroyed by thunderbolts. In the event, according to Dio, Gaius uttered threats against the statue and had another one put up for himself.[15]

Now, the account of the first statue (that is, the statue to be set up in the temple at Jerusalem) cannot be discounted as anecdotal.[16] The proposal to transport the statue of Zeus Olympios to Rome, however, might be anecdotal given the coincidence between the potential fates of the two legates, Petronius and Regulus. Nevertheless, whether or not either account is accepted as historically accurate, we are given a chronological context for the alleged identification of Gaius with Iuppiter; that is, at the very end of the emperor's reign.

This topic of Gaius' relationship with Iuppiter is today a commonplace. Weinstock makes full use of the belief that Gaius identified himself with the god to support his own contention that Gaius Caesar, the dictator, had a temple decreed to him as Iuppiter Iulius by the Senate.[17] However that may be, our sources disagree on the extent to which the emperor Gaius was identified with the god.

In three of our sources (Seneca, Suetonius, and Dio) we are given contexts for the famous challenge that Gaius issued to Iuppiter, "ἤ μ'ἀνάειρ' ἢ ἐγὼ σέ." Our earliest source, however, Seneca, does not place this challenge in a religious context but at an *al fresco* production of pantomimes that was disrupted by thunderous weather (de Ira 1. 20. 8). Seneca continues: (de Ira 1. 20. 9) "Quanta dementia fuit! Putavit aut sibi noceri ne ab Iove quidem posse aut se nocere etiam Iovi posse. Non puto parum momenti hanc eius vocem ad incitandas coniuratorum mentes addidisse: ultimae enim patientiae visum est eum ferre qui Iovem non ferret." In this passage we, surely, are not presented with Gaius identifying himself with Iuppiter, but exactly the opposite. Here in the challenge and in Seneca's comment we are presented with a Gaius who claims to be Iuppiter's equal and who, more importantly, appears as Iuppiter's rival. There is no question here of a formal identification of the emperor with Iuppiter of the sort that is proposed for Caesar by Weinstock.[18] Moreover, given Seneca's comment that the challenge to Iuppiter stimulated the conspirators who killed Gaius, we are once more given a hint that any relationship that Gaius had with the god came very late in his reign.

The suggestion that Gaius might have regarded himself as Iuppiter's equal and, perhaps, adversary has some support from the near contemporary of Seneca, Josephus, who states that Gaius "εἰς τε τοῦ Διὸς φοιτῶν τὸ ἱερόν, ὃ Καπετώλιον μὲν καλοῦσιν ..., ἀδελφὸν ἐτόλμησε προσαγορεύειν τὸν Δία" (AJ 19. 4).[19] Also, a little later in his narrative (AJ 19. 11), Josephus gives us yet another example of Gaius' madness.[20] According to Josephus, Gaius also placed his infant daughter (Drusilla) on the lap of the statue of Iuppiter in the Capitoline temple "κοινὸν αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ Διὶ γεγονέναι τὸ τέκνον καὶ δύο χειροτονεῖν αὐτῆς πατέρας, ὁπότερον μείζονα φάμενος ἐν μέσῳ τε καταλιμπάνειν." Clearly, neither of these two passages can be taken to imply an identification of the emperor with the god. Indeed, the second passage of Josephus (AJ 19. 11) indicates not so much an identification, as Smallwood suggests, but an adversary position adopted by the emperor who believed himself to be Iuppiter's equal.[21]

Suetonius also gives an account of Gaius' challenge to Iuppiter, which differs in context from Seneca's anecdote: (Suet. Gaius 22. 4)

"*Et noctibus quidem plenam fulgentemque lunam invitabat assidue in amplexus atque concubitum, interdiu vero cum Capitolino Iove secreto fabulabatur, modo insusurrans ac praebens in vicem aurem, modo clarius nec sine iurgiis. Nam vox comminantis audita est*: ἢ μ' ἀνάειρ' ἢ ἐγὼ σέ, *donec exoratus, ut referebat, et in contubernium ultro invitatus super templum Divi Augusti ponte transmisso Palatium Capitoliumque coniunxit. Mox, quo proprior esset, in area Capitolina novae domus fundamenta iecit*." Once again, we are presented with a Gaius who believed himself to be Iuppiter's equal and, to some degree, Iuppiter's rival. Certainly, there is no suggestion here that Gaius identified himself with the god. Nor is there the slightest hint of such an identification later in Suetonius' biography when Gaius specifically asks the actor Apelles who appears to be the greater, Iuppiter or himself : (*Gaius* 33) "*Inter varios iocos, cum assistens simulacro Iovis Apellen tragoedum consuluisset uter illi maior videretur ....*" Such a question could not have been put had Gaius formally identified himself with Iuppiter. Dio also records a similar question, but this time put to an unnamed Gaul who saw Gaius dressed up as Iuppiter issuing prophecies from a platform (59. 26. 8-9): "τί σοι δοκῶ εἶναι;" asks Gaius. "Μέγα παραλήρημα," answers the Gaul. If this anecdote is not merely an elaboration of a theme given a different context by Suetonius (Gaius 33), it is notable that the Gaul escaped punishment for his audacity. Perhaps not, as Dio suggests, because the Gaul was of lowly status and only a shoemaker ("σκυτοτόμος"), but because the Gaul had seen through Gaius' blasphemy. (It is possible, of course, to regard the question recorded by Dio as an elaboration: in Suetonius' account Gaius merely stands beside a statue of Iuppiter, while, in Dio's narrative, Gaius assumes Iuppiter's persona.)

There are two other passages in Suetonius' biography of Gaius that have been taken to indicate that Gaius identified himself with Iuppiter. First, the biographer states that, among other surnames, the emperor assumed the *cognomen* "*optimus maximus Caesar*" (*Gaius* 22. 1).[22] At first glance, it certainly appears as if we are here presented with irrefutable evidence for Gaius' "*Angleichung an Juppiter*," as Frei-Stolba asserts.[23] What, however, was so offensive to Suetonius in this formula that he recorded its adoption by Gaius among the actions of the "*monstrum*" ? This is a question of some importance, for, at the time Suetonius wrote his biographies, the similar formula "*optimus maximusque princeps*" was well known and had been used by both Trajan and Hadrian. For Suetonius, then, to suggest that the adoption of this formula, and the consequent "*Gleichsetzung des Herrschers mit Juppiter*," was somehow uncharacteristic of a "*princeps*" would surely have been quite impolitic; even if reference to the formula was designed as an oblique slight against the emperor Hadrian.[24] That Suetonius records Gaius' adoption of the name "*optimus maximus Caesar*" as an example of Gaius' impiety cannot be doubted. The record however, is only understandable, to my mind, if an opposite view is taken; namely, that Gaius, so far from identifying himself with Iuppiter by the association of the god's formula with his own name--the name "Caesar" was not yet a title in imperial nomenclature--consciously rejected such an identification and, according to Suetonius or his sources, set himself up as Iuppiter's equal and rival. [25]

In the second major passage of Suetonius' biography of Gaius that touches upon the emperor's religious excesses, we are, I believe, given a clear indication that, so far as the biographer was concerned, the emperor did not establish a formal cult of himself at Rome in the persona of Iuppiter. (Gaius 22. 2-3) "... partem Palatii ad forum usque promovit, atque aede Castoris et Pollucis in vestibulum transfigurata, consistens saepe inter fratres deos, medium adorandum se adeuntibus exhibebat; et quidam eum Latiarem Iovem consalutarunt. templum etiam numini suo proprium et sacerdotes et excogitatissimas hostias instituit."

The first important point to observe in this passage is the unambiguous distinction between the "templum ... numini suo proprium" and the informal address as Iuppiter Latiaris. This, as we shall see below (p.129), is not consistent with Dio's account of the affair and is, in fact, more restrained than the narrative of the third century historian. The second important detail in the passage cited is the statement that "*et quidam eum Latiarem Iovem consalutarunt*." It is to be noted that, according to Suetonius, Gaius did *not* identify himself with Iuppiter Latiaris as he stood--or his statue stood, as Niemeyer tentatively suggests [26]--between the statues of the Dioscuri. Indeed, the phrase "*et quidam*" clearly suggests the opposite; namely that some people, not all, addressed him as Iuppiter Latiaris. The term of address, therefore, was informal and, perhaps, tinged with a certain degree of irony. [27]

Dio is the last of our sources to mention Gaius' famous challenge to Iuppiter. Dio states (59. 28. 6) that Gaius "ταῖς τε βρονταῖς ἐκ μηχανῆς τινος ἀντεβρόντα καὶ ταῖς ἀστραπαῖς ἀντήστραπτε· καὶ ὁπότε κεραυνὸς καταπέσοι, λίθον ἀντηκόντιζεν, ἐπιλέγων ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ τὸ τοῦ 'Ομήρου 'ἤ μ' ἀνάειρ' ἢ ἐγὼ σέ'." When compared with the context given by Seneca for the challenge (above p. 121), it is clear that Dio has made use of an enhanced version of the same story, or has elaborated on the tradition himself. In Seneca's version, though the challenge is given as an example of the emperor's "*dementia*," we are told that it was issued because Gaius had a performance of pantomimes disrupted by bad weather. In Dio's account, on the other hand, the context for the challenge is corrupted to the point where Gaius actually constructs machinery to answer Iuppiter's thunder and to respond in kind to Iuppiter's flashes of lightning. Whatever the cause of this corruption, however, one thing is clear in this passage of Dio: once again Gaius is portrayed as Iuppiter's rival.

In fact, there is only one passage in all our ancient sources--apart, that is, from those which are concerned with the statues to be erected at Jerusalem or removed from Olympia--that explicitly makes Gaius establish a cult of himself at Rome and in the guise of Iuppiter. In this passage (Dio 59. 28. 5-6) we are told that Gaius "Δία τε

Λατιάριον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, τήν τε Καισωνίαν τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν Κλαύδιον ἄλλους τε τοὺς πλουσιωτάτους ἱερέας προσέθετο, πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίας ἐπὶ τούτῳ παρ' ἑκάστου μυριάδας λαβών. καὶ προσέτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἱερᾶτο, τόν τε ἵππον συνιερέα ἀπέφηνε· καὶ ὄρνιθες αὐτῷ ἀπαλοί τέ τινες καὶ πολυτίμητοι καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐθύοντο." Dio also goes on to support this assertion by stating that Gaius even included the name of Iuppiter in documents: (59. 28. 8) "Οὗτος οὖν ὁ θεὸς καὶ οὗτος ὁ Ζεὺς (καὶ γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο τὰ τελευταῖα οὕτως, ὥστε καὶ ἐς γράμματα φέρεσθαι) ... χρήματα ... συνελέγετο."

This second statement is in some senses problematic; for there are no extant documents of state or items of official correspondence ("γράμματα") surviving from the reign of Gaius that bear the signature of Iuppiter. This lack, however, cannot be used against Dio's account. On the other hand, the evidence reviewed above suggests that any relationship Gaius might have had with Iuppiter came very late in his reign, with the result that, perhaps, we should not expect the survival of such documents, if any ever existed.[28] It is much more probable that what we are presented with here is another example of the way in which Dio (or his sources) has elaborated on a tradition and, perhaps, has misinterpreted that tradition. We are told by Suetonius that Gaius assumed the name "optimus maximus Caesar" (in opposition to, not in identification with, Iuppiter), and it is, perhaps, this tradition that Dio has misconstrued. That Dio has enhanced or elaborated on earlier versions of Gaius' divine aspirations is not open to doubt. In addition to the possible example of such elaboration given above (p.124), we also have the statement that Gaius wished to take over for his own cult the Didymeion at Miletus (59. 28. 1). This statement, however, not only runs counter to the surviving epigraphic evidence [29], it also lies in direct conflict with Suetonius' report of this planned completion that is included by the biographer among the actions of the emperor "quasi de principe" (Gaius 21).

Dio states that Gaius established a cult of himself at Rome "Δία τε Λατιάριον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας." This assertion, however, contradicts the testimony of Suetonius who makes a clear distinction between the establishment of the cult of Gaius and the way in which some people addressed the emperor as he (or his statue) stood "*inter fratres deos*" (above, p. 126). In addition, Dio mentions the consecration of the emperor's horse to the new cult--an act, that is, which is not reported by any other source and which, as Willrich has suggested, was probably merely "*eine Dublette von Incitatus' Konsulat*."[30] On the other hand, we have seen that Seneca believed Gaius' opposition to Iuppiter actually spurred on the successful conspirators of A.D. 41. Also, we have seen that this topic of the emperor's opposition to Iuppiter is common not only to Seneca, but also to Suetonius and Dio himself. Thus, although there can be no certainty here, the weight of evidence supplied by our ancient sources casts grave doubts on the accuracy of Dio's report at this point. Neither Seneca nor Suetonius had any cause to moderate their accounts of Gaius' "dementia" and they do not suggest that Gaius formally established a cult of himself at Rome in the guise of Iuppiter Latiaris. To my mind, therefore, it is most probable that Dio here has made a simple mistake and that the emperor did not institute a cult of himself in the persona of Iuppiter.

There are valid grounds, then, for believing that the charge of impiety laid against Gaius by our uniformly hostile sources stemmed not so much from the emperor's alleged identification with Iuppiter but from a reported rejection of that god. Gaius assumed the name "optimus maximus Caesar" in direct opposition to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. Similarly, Gaius planned to remove the statue of Zeus from Olympia, bring it to Rome, and replace the features of that god with his own. The god, however, unlike Apelles (Suet. Gaius 33), knew who was more powerful, laughed at Gaius' presumption, and remained where he was. "Pridie quam periret [Gaius], somniavit consistere se in caelo iuxta solium Iovis impulsumque ab eo dextri pedis pollice et in terras praecipitatum"

(Suet. Gaius 57. 3).[31]

So far in this chapter an attempt has been made to review the sources for the emperor Gaius' relationship with Iuppiter and to explain, in terms that are consistent with the propagandist bias of these sources, the charge of impiety which arose from that relationship. Throughout the first century of our era, and later, the inhabitants of the Roman world were ever conscious of the parallel that existed between Iuppiter and the reigning emperor: "Iuppiter arces / temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis, / terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque" (Ovid Met. 15. 858ff.). Thus, a statue of a current ruler bearing the attributes of, or represented as, Iuppiter should not be thought to elevate that ruler to divine status: "der Kaiser auch in diesem nicht 'als Gott', sondern 'als Kaiser' dargestellt werden sollte."[32] According to our ancient sources, however, Gaius rejected this identification and what was implicit therein; namely that, though "princeps" on earth, he was still subject to Iuppiter who ruled in heaven.[33] What, then, was the nature of the cult established by Gaius after his return from the northern campaign in A.D. 40 ?

III

Gaius and his cult

In summer A.D. 40 Gaius returned to Italy and, celebrating an ovation, officially entered the city on 31 August.[34] At this time, according to Dio (59. 25. 5), he threatened the Senate with destruction because it had not voted him "τὰ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον." He then established a cult. That the cult was established at this late date in Gaius' reign has been accepted by all modern authorities and is indicated by the sources referred to above.[35] The late date is also implicit in Suetonius' statement (*Claud*. 9. 2) that the final humiliation to which the future emperor Claudius was subjected during his nephew's reign was his reduction to bankruptcy as a result of his appointment to the "novum sacerdotium" at the cost of some eight million sesterces.[36]

Now, Suetonius is the first of our ancient authorities to give an account of the establishment of this cult. He tells us (Gaius 22. 3) that the emperor "templum etiam numini suo proprium et sacerdotes et excogitatissimas hostias instituit. in templo simulacrum stabat aureum iconicum amiciebaturque cotidie veste, quali ipse uteretur. magisteria sacerdotii ditissimus quisque et ambitione et licitatione maxima vicibus comparabant. hostiae erant phoenicopteri, pavones, tetraones, numidicae, meleagrides, phasianae, quae generatim per singulos dies immolarentur." This is followed immediately by the account of Gaius' intimate relationship with the Moon, his challenge to Iuppiter, the bridge "super templum divi Augusti," and the "novae domus fundamenta" on the Capitol.[37]

This account, however, is not wholly consistent with our only other source for the establishment of the cult, Dio (59. 28. 2ff.):

"τότε δὲ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξήχθη, ὥστε καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ τὸν μὲν ὑπο τῆς βουλῆς ψηφισθέντα τὸν δὲ ἰδίᾳ ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ, ποιήσασθαι. ἐτεκτήνατο μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ κατάλυσίν τινα, ἵν', ὡς ἔλεγε, τῷ Διὶ συνοικοίη· ἀπαξιώσας δὲ δὴ τὰ δευτερεῖα ἐν τῇ συνοικήσει αὐτοῦ φέρεσθαι, καὶ προσεγκαλέσας οἱ ὅτι τὸ Καπιτώλιον προκατέλαβεν, οὕτω δὴ ἕτερόν τε νεὼν ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ σπουδῇ ᾠκοδομήσατο ...." Dio further states that the cult was set up to worship Gaius as Iuppiter Latiaris (see above, p. 128).

Firstly, Suetonius tells us that Gaius built ("*instituit*") a temple "*numini suo proprium*." Dio, on the other hand, tells us that the object of worship was Gaius in the persona of Iuppiter Latiaris. Secondly, although Suetonius refers to the "*novae domus fundamenta*" on the Capitol as an example of Gaius' religious excesses, the biographer actually mentions only one temple associated with the cult. Dio, however, according to all modern authorities, appears to have believed in the existence of two temples, of which one, we are told, was on the Palatine and the other on the

Capitol. Which of the two temples was primarily associated with the cult has not been determined. Gelzer, Willrich, Balsdon, and Garzetti, for example, suggest that the major centre for the cult was on the Palatine.[38] Eitrem and Gagé, on the other hand, suggest the Capitol.[39] Also, Balsdon, who correctly informs us that the first temple's "situation is not described," goes on to tell us that the temple on the *Capitol* was unfinished at the time of Gaius' murder.[40] (The two most authoritative voices on Roman religion, Wissowa and Latte, remain silent.)[41] The differences between our sources, Suetonius and Dio, are major. They should not, however, hide from us the fact that Suetonius and Dio appear to have employed the same or similar sources in the composition of their works.[42] They relate the same events (though occasionally in different contexts[43]), they contain verbal correspondences (for example, Dio 59. 28. 3 "ὡς ἔλεγε" -- Suet. *Gaius* 22. 4 "*ut referebat*"), and each gives us detail not supplied by the other. Thus, for all the apparent enhancement of the tradition by Dio [44], the evidence supplied by one source may be used--where there are no disagreements--to complement the information supplied by the other.

I have suggested already that Dio was probably mistaken in his belief that Gaius set up the cult at Rome in order to be worshipped as Iuppiter Latiaris. [45] Even so, Dio does give us one piece of information that is wholly credible and that is not supplied by Suetonius; namely that the Senate decreed a temple to Gaius ("ναὸν ... ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ψηφισθέντα"). That the Senate was the competent authority for such action during Gaius' reign receives confirmation from the fact that it was still the appropriate body under Claudius and Nero and from the fact that Dio himself records Gaius' anger at not being voted "τὰ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον" by the Senate on his return to Rome. [46] Also, it is to be noted that candidates for the "*novum sacerdotium*" were obliged to pay for the honor of their appointment. [47] Did the Senate, then, decree a temple to Gaius so that he could be worshipped as a god "*vielleicht* eben mit dem Titel 'Caesar O.M.'," as Eitrem has suggested ? [48]

This is a question that cannot by answered with any degree of certainty. Our sources are all hostile toward the emperor and his works after his return to Rome in A.D. 40. If we reject the evidence supplied by these sources, on the grounds of bias, and accept the view that Gaius maintained his attitude of restraint announced earlier in his reign (Dio 59. 4. 4 [49]), we are left with nothing that can form a basis for a picture of Gaius as a rational but much maligned emperor. If, on the other hand, we accept the reports of Philo, Suetonius, and Dio that Gaius made himself a god, our inquiry also comes to a close; for we cannot ascertain under what guise the emperor was officially worshipped as a god.

Fortunately, however, there are certain, very slight indications in our ancient sources which suggest that Gaius in the actual establishment of the cult did not receive a formal deification and that he was not officially viewed as a god. This, of course, is not to discount the possibility that Gaius impersonated a host of deities during the last few months of his reign, as Philo, Suetonius, and Dio assert. Nevertheless, what we are confronted with here --if we accept Dio's statement that the Senate voted Gaius a temple--is a formal act of deification and not an unofficial association of the ruler with a particular celestial being.

First, however, an attempt must be made to find out just how many temples were associated with a cult of Gaius at Rome in A.D. 40.

In the passage of Dio set out above (59. 28. 2ff.; p. 136), we are told that Gaius "τότε δὲ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξήχθη, ὥστε καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ʽΡώμῃ ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ, τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ψηφισθέντα τὸν δὲ ἰδίᾳ ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ, ποιήσασθαι." This sentence is then followed by another sentence which should be taken to explain it: "ἐτεκτήνατο μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ κατάλυσίν τινα ... ἕτερόν τε νεὼν ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ σπουδῇ ᾠκοδομήσατο ...." Now, on the basis of these two sentences, all modern scholars appear to believe in the existence, or proposed existence [50], of two temples--on the Palatine and on the Capitol. There is, however, a fundamental problem with such an interpretation: in the first sentence we are not presented with two temples but only with one. The grammatical construction of the sentence is quite clear: there is a single substantive ("ναὸν") that is qualified by "partitive apposition" ("τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ψηφισθέντα ... τὸν δε ἰδίᾳ ..."). [51] Thus, when considered in isolation from the second sentence ("ἐτεκτήνατο μὲν γὰρ ..."), its meaning is altered radically from that which is proposed for it by other scholars: Gaius built a temple "ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ" that was, on the one hand, voted to him by the Senate and, on the other hand, paid for out of his own pocket ("ἰδίᾳ"). Clearly, there is some confusion in Dio's account at this point; for, in the second sentence, Dio refers to a second temple, "ἕτερόν τε νεὼν". Also, this second sentence certainly contains two structures. The first structure mentioned, however, on the Capitol, is not referred to as a temple but is described as a "κατάλυσίν τινα". Now, the substantive "κατάλυσις" generally is interpreted to mean a billet or lodging and I can find no instance of its use, by the figure of metonymy, to represent a temple.[52] There is, then, a possibility that Dio has confused the accounts of his sources and that there was in reality only one temple associated with the cult he is about to describe.

When we turn to Suetonius' evidence, we find a possible source for the third century historian's confusion. Suetonius openly associates only one temple with the cult of Gaius in A.D. 40: "*templum etiam ... instituit* [Gaius]." Suetonius, however, also mentions the fact that Gaius "*in area Capitolina novae domus fundamenta iecit*," and closely associates these foundations with the emperor's religious excesses. Gaius, we are told, eventually yielded to Iuppiter's invitation to live with him ("*in contubernium ultro invitatus ...*").[53] Nevertheless, the word "*domus*" in Suetonius' work is never used to refer to a temple. It is, on the other hand, regularly used to refer to the emperor's palace or primary residence in Rome.[54] Inasmuch as the "κατάλυσις" in Dio's account and the "*novae domus fundamenta*" of Suetonius were both situated on the Capitol, there can be little doubt that both words refer to the same structure. This probability is enhanced still further by the possible verbal echo of Suetonius' word "*contubernium*" in Dio's description "κατάλύσιν τινα"; for both words are used to indicate temporary lodgings or billets.[55] It is possible, then, given that Suetonius and Dio appear to have had similar sources, that Dio, who started off his description with one temple ("ναὸν") but ended up with two ("ἕτερόν τε νεὼν"), has confused the evidence supplied by his sources. I submit, therefore, that modern scholars have consistently misinterpreted the evidence provided by our ancient sources and that, in reality, there was only one temple associated with a cult of Gaius at Rome in A.D. 40.

We must return now to the major topic under consideration at the moment; namely the nature of the cult of Gaius at Rome.

So far, I believe, we have seen that Gaius probably did not identify himself with Iuppiter and that, in fact, he consciously rejected such an identification.[56] We have seen also that there is a strong possibility that the Senate voted Gaius a temple in A.D. 40 and that Gaius paid for the erection of this temple on the Palatine out of his own pocket. Moreover, if we accept Dio's statement that this temple was decreed by the Senate, there can be no doubt, in my opinion, the the cult was officially established at Rome. That no official or quasi-official documents survive attesting the existence of the cult is not, as Balsdon suggests, evidence for its unofficial nature.[57] Was Gaius, then, worshipped officially as a "*praesens deus*" ? I believe that he was not, though the evidence for this assertion is particularly slender.

Firstly, we are told by Dio (59. 28. 6) that Gaius "αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ ἰερᾶτο." This is a statement that is supported also by Suetonius (*Gaius* 57. 4) who tells us that Gaius "*sacrificans respersus est phoenicopteri sanguine*."[58] (The flamingo was one of the "*excogitatissimae hostiae*" that were "*generatim per singulos dies immolarentur*," *Gaius* 22. 3.) Now, had Gaius become a "*praesens deus*," is it likely that he would have sacrificed to himself and is it likely that he would have been numbered among the official priests consecrated to his cult ? For my part, I think it quite improbable. A god, after all, is one who receives sacrifices. A god does not offer sacrifices. It is noteworthy here that Dio, in an earlier passage unrelated to the establishment of this cult, tells us that whenever Gaius impersonated a particular god sacrifices would be offered to him: "καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ ἱκετεῖα καὶ εὐχαὶ θυσίαι τε κατὰ πρόσφορον προσήγοντο" (59. 26. 10). There is no suggestion that Gaius, during such impersonations, offered sacrifices himself.

Secondly, there is the testimony of Suetonius that Gaius "*templum etiam numini suo proprium ... instituit*" (*Gaius* 22. 3). There can be no doubt, of course, that the biographer regarded this act as an indication of the emperor's religious arrogance. Also, Suetonius regularly uses the word "_numen_" to refer to deities of one sort or another.[59] Nevertheless, it is possible that Suetonius has in this instance recorded accurately what the emperor did. Suetonius does not tell us that Gaius erected a temple to himself but one "_numini suo proprium_." If Gaius, then, erected a temple dedicated to his "_numen_", it is possible to see that, in the _official_ establishment of the cult by the Senate at the emperor's instigation, Gaius, so far from overtly rejecting the policy of restraint adopted by Augustus and Tiberius, actually followed Augustan precedent.[60] Augustus himself approved _circa_ A.D. 9 the erection of an altar on the Palatine dedicated to his "_numen_"--the _Ara Numinis Augusti_.[61]

The line, however, drawn between the cult of the emperor's "_numen_" or "_genius_" and the cult of the emperor as a manifest god was extremely fine.[62] Outside Italy, Augustus, Tiberius, and other members of the imperial family received divine honors.[63] Even within Italy, Augustus was addressed in terms more appropriate to a god than to a mortal.[64] After Gaius, Claudius, who did not become a god during his lifetime, was addressed as "*deus*" and "*numen*." Claudius also figures in the quasi-official record of the Arval Brethren as "*divinus princeps*."[65] Nero, according to the epigraphic evidence, had "*flamines*" during his reign.[66] (It is worth emphasizing, however, that even this ruler, whose excesses were as legendary as those of Gaius, rejected a proposal that a temple be erected to him "*Divo Neroni*", "*nam deum honor principi non ante habetur quam inter homines desierit*.")[67]

There can be little doubt, then, that, in the popular conception at least, the ruling emperor was equated with the gods. Nevertheless, in official terms, there remained a distinction between the divine nature of the emperor's power and recognition of the emperor as a "*praesens deus*." Thus, even if, as I suspect, the cult established at Rome in A.D. 40 was associated with the worship of Gaius' "*numen*" and not with

Gaius as a manifest god, we can assume that, as far as possible, Gaius wished to blur that distinction. According to Suetonius and Dio, he sacrificed rare and costly birds, perhaps, as Köberlein has suggested, as "*Vertreter des Phönix*" for the "*tägliche Erneuerung des Lebens des Kaisers*."[68] Also, according to Suetonius, Gaius placed within the temple dedicated to his "*numen*" a "*simulacrum ... aureum iconicum*." While there may be some doubt that this statue actually symbolized the apotheosis of the emperor, there can be no doubt that Gaius, so far as Suetonius was concerned, wished it to be regarded in some sense as a cult statue.[69] In placing the "*simulacrum*" within the temple, therefore, Gaius exceeded by far the restrictions imposed on ruler worship at Rome by Tiberius; for Tiberius "*templa, flamines, sacerdotes decerni sibi prohibuit, etiam statuas atque imagines nisi permittente se poni; permisitque ea sola condicione, ne inter simulacra deorum sed inter ornamenta aedium ponerentur*."

IV

Conclusions

In this chapter I have attempted to review the evidence for the divine aspirations of Gaius that became manifest toward the close of his reign. From an examination of the sources for the emperor's alleged identification with Iuppiter, it has become apparent that there are valid grounds for supposing that a charge of impiety against Gaius in antiquity was based not on such an identification with, or assimilation to, the god, but on Gaius' rivalry with Iuppiter. We may agree, therefore with Seneca who stated (De Ira 1. 20. 9): "Non puto parum momenti hanc eius vocem [the challenge] ad incitandas coniuratorum mentes addidisse: ultimae enim patientiae visum est eum ferre qui non Iovem non ferret."

Moreover, an examination of the evidence for the establishment of the cult of Gaius in A.D. 40 at Rome reveals the strong possibility that Gaius was not formally deified during his lifetime. Indeed, it may be suggested tentatively--our sources allow no certainty--that the cult was set up to honor Gaius' "*numen*", that is, his divine power or authority. It is possible also that the cult was established by a decree of the Senate and that there was no more than one temple associated with it. Gaius, however, appears to have followed Augustan precedent in the establishment of this cult only insofar as it related to the worship of his "*numen*". Our ancient sources make it quite clear that Gaius had aspirations to divinity and desired "τὰ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον." These aspirations were gratified to an unknown extent in the elaborate rites that were associated with the cult and by the placement of a "*simulacrum*" within the temple on the Palatine (the most likely location). In the event, however, the cult was extremely short-lived and, on 24 January A.D. 41, "Γάιος ... ὡς οὐκ ἦν θεὸς ἔμαθεν."[70] *

SUMMARY

This dissertation contains six studies of historical topics in the reigns of the first three Roman emperors Augustus, Tiberius and Gaius.

In the first study it is suggested that the future emperor Claudius was indeed born on the very day that the monumental altar at Lyon was dedicated to Rome and Augustus, that is, 1 August 10 B.C. This finding has some relevance in our appreciation of the use of Suetonius as a valid historical source.

The second study examines the evidence for the date of dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus in 2 B.C. The suggestion is made that this temple was not dedicated on 1 August as scholars currently believe but on 12 May. Also, little evidence is found to support the continued belief in the existence of a small aedicula dedicated to Mars Ultor on the Capitol in 20-19 B.C.

The third study is divided into two parts,

of which the first deals with the change in *praenomen* of the elder Drusus and the second with Claudius' change in *cognomen* in A.D. 4. It is suggested that the elder Drusus changed his *praenomen* from Decimus to Nero in 24 B.C. out of a desire to associate himself more closely with his favored brother, the future emperor Tiberius. Claudius, it is discovered, received the honorific *cognomen* Germanicus in 9 B.C. at the time it was bestowed by the Senate on his dead father, the elder Drusus, and his brother. In A.D. 4, when his brother entered the Julian house as the adoptive son of the future emperor Tiberius, Claudius discarded his current *cognomen* Drusus and assumed what had been until the adoptions his elder brother's familial *cognomen* Nero.

The fourth study in this dissertation is concerned with the changes in electoral procedure adopted by Tiberius on his accession in A.D. 14. It is suggested that Tacitus did not err, as some scholars assert, in his statement (*Ann*. 1. 15) "*tum primum comitia e campo ad patres translata sunt*." Rather, this statement should be thought to refer to a stage in the electoral process after the "destination" of suitable candidates had been made in accordance with the terms of the Lex Valeria Cornelia of A.D. 5. At this point, prior to A.D. 14, the names of such candidates were announced to the assembled "comitia centuriata" and were approved or rejected. It is suggested that, in the praetorian elections of A.D. 14 and in subsequent years, the names of "destined" candidates were read out in the Senate for approval or rejection and not before the "comitia centuriata." This would explain Gaius' experiment in democracy and its failure recorded in Dio 59. 20. 4.

The fifth study examines in depth the sources for the alleged conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus in A.D. 39. No evidence is found to support the widely held belief that a plot was formed against the emperor Gaius prior to his journey north in the fall of A.D. 39. Rather, it appears that Lepidus may have been executed because of his adultery with the emperor's sisters and Gaetulicus removed because of his incompetence in managing the affairs of his province and maintaining the security of the northern frontier of the empire.

The last study in this dissertation is concerned with the alleged aspirations to divinity of the emperor Gaius that became apparent after his return from the northern campaigns in A.D. 40. It is suggested that the charges of impiety and aberration laid by our ancient sources against Gaius stemmed not so much from an attempted identification with Iuppiter but from his rejection of that god. Moreover, it is suggested that there was only one temple associated with this man's cult and that it was established not to worship him as a god but to honor his "numen."

The historical problems discussed in this dissertation are some of those that I have pursued to fairly satisfactory conclusions over the past three years. These conclusions, however, do not assume that no more re-assessment of the evidence is possible. Indeed, the nature of the evidence, and of scholarly research, necessarily precludes complete agreement on the part of the reader. The historical sources for the activities of the earlier Julio-Claudian emperors (as for Claudius and Nero) appear capable of never ending re-evaluation. I should be offended, therefore, if future scholars were to accept the fruits of my endeavor in the same way that several modern scholars appear to have accepted the solutions proposed by their predecessors, without the careful examination of basic assumptions and each fragment of evidence--the primary objective of this dissertation.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. See also below, Chapter 3, II, "The Early Name of the Emperor Claudius," pp. 41 to 52 for a similar rejection of the evidence supplied by Suetonius.

2. The text is that of M. Ihm, C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera, Vol. 1, De Vita Caesarum Libri, Leipzig (1908), reprint Stuttgart (1958). For a more recent edition see J.L. Wall, Prolegomena to the Study of the Manuscripts of Suetonius, and a Critical Edition of the Lives of Nero and Claudius, Diss. London (1968).

3. Iullus Antonius, PIR^2: 153f.; A. Fabius Maximus, PIR^2: xii, 102f.

4. Suet. Claud. 10. 1, id. 45; Seneca Apoc. 3. 1, id. 6. 1; Dio 60. 2. 1, id. 60. 5. 3; CIL X 6388; CIL I^2: 240 and 248. (The evidence of the calendars, f.a. Vallenses and the f.a. Antiates, also appears in H. Smilda, C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii, Diss. Groningen (1896): 12ff.; K. Vivell, Chronologisch-kritische

Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Claudius, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Heidelberg i. B. (1911): 56; V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius ^{2}, Oxford (1955): 50.

5. It is not my purpose here to enter into a lengthy discussion of the altar "Romae et Augusto" at Lugdunum or the religious and political function of it and the council of the Three Gauls. See the references in, for example, E. Kornemann, Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte, Klio 1 (1901): 108-110; H. Heinen, Zur Begründung des römischen Kaiserkultes, von 48 v. bis 14 n. Chr., Klio 11 (1911): 129-177; A. Audin and P. Quoniam, Victoires et colonnes de l'autel fédéral des Trois Gaules, Gallia 20 (1963): 103-116; J. Deininger, Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit, Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, Band 6, Munich (1965); D. Fishwick, The Temple of the Three Gauls,

JRS 62 (1972): 46-52, id. The Severi and the provincial cult of the Three Gauls, Historia 22 (1973): 627-649. See also D. Fishwick, The development of ruler worship in the western Roman empire, ANRW II. 16. 2 (in press).

6. For the ancient evidence for the census taken by the elder Drusus in 13 B.C., see Livy Per. 139; Dio 54. 32. 1; CIL XIII 1668 (E.M. Smallwood, Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero, Cambridge [1967]: 99).

7. For example, Audin and Quoniam, op. cit. (above n. 5): 108; Fishwick (1972): 46.

8. For example, T.R. Holmes, The Architect of the Roman Empire, Vol. 2, Oxford (1931): 157f.

9. J.C. Rolfe, Suetonius, Vol. 2, London (1914): 6; H. Ailloud, Suétone. Vie des douze Césars ^{4}, Paris (1967): 112.

10. For Rolfe and Ailloud, see above n. 9. For a municipal cult of Rome and Augustus at Lyon later in the first century, see Fishwick (1972): 49, n. 31 and the

authorities cited there.

11. There are some problems regarding Suetonius' formulae for recording the ages of emperors at their death. See, among others, V. D'Anto, Sviste ed errori nei dati cronologici di Suetonio e di altri biografi minori, *AFLF*, Naples, 7 (1957): 117-143; G.V. Sumner, Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, *Latomus* 26 (1967): 413-435. The birth-date of Titus is problematic; for Suetonius' record can either refer to 30 December A.D. 41 or to 30 December A.D. 40 (Sumner, *op. cit*., 420). If Titus was in his forty-second year on his death on 13 September A.D. 81 (*Suet. Titus* 11; Dio 66. 18. 4) then he should have been born in A.D. 39. According to Sumner, however, "... if Titus was born 30 Dec. 40, his age at death could be expressed by the rounded-off figure *quadraginta unum annos natus*, which then by conversion becomes *altero et quadragesimo aetatis anno*." See also A. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines*, trans. J.R. Foster, London (1974): 642f.

12. Cf. Holmes, loc. cit. (above n. 8).

13. See above p. 11.

14. On the identification of this altar "dei Caesaris" with the monumental altar at Lyon, see Fishwick (1972): 47, n. 13, id. (1973): 627ff.

15. See above n. 6. Implicit in L.R. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 1, Middletown (1931): 207 is the notion that the festival mentioned in Dio was intended to be of a non-recurring nature. Dio's account very clearly implies the opposite.

16. For example, see Deininger, op. cit. (above n. 5): 23, nn. 3-5; C.M. Wells, The German Policy of Augustus. An Examination of the Archaeological Evidence, Oxford (1972): 267, where Wells accepts Suetonius' date of 10 B.C.

17. For the possible existence of a festival at Lyon in pre-Roman times, see C. Jullien, Histoire de la Gaule, IV^2 Paris (1921): 163,

n. 4. Jullien suggested that the ducking received by Claudius in A.D. 39 when he arrived at Lyon at the head of a senatorial delegation to the emperor Gaius was adapted by that emperor from local custom (Suet. *Gaius* 20; cf. Juvenal *Sat*. 1. 42ff.). For the survival, perhaps, of a similar cult in Cisalpine Gaul, see Catullus 17; cf. Th. Birt, *Pontifex* und *sexagenarii de ponte*, RhM 75 (1926): 124; H.A. Khan, Image and Symbol in Catullus 17, *CP* 64 (1969): 88ff. and 96.

18. Cf. Taylor, *op. cit*. (above n. 15): 207, n. 6.

19. Cf. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*^{2}, Munich (1912): 473f.; Fishwick (1972): 51, n. 57.

20. P. Guiraud, *Les assemblées provinciales dans l'empire romaine*, Paris (1887): 45; V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, Teil I, Band 1, Leipzig (1896), reprint Stuttgart (1964): 672, n. 10. Similarly, Hirschfeld, *CIL* XIII: 228.

21. See D. Fishwick, Templum Divo Claudio Constitutum, Britannia 3 (1972): 171-178 and below Chapter 2, n. 23.

22. For the "constitution" of the Ara Fortunae Reduci in 19 B.C., see the f.a. Amiternini for 12 October (CIL I^2: 245). The Ara Pacis Augustae was similarly "constituted" in 13 B.C. (f.a. Amiternini and f.a. Antiates for 4 July [CIL I^2: 244 and 248]) and dedicated on 30 January 9 B.C. For the early primacy of the "constitution" of altars and temples, see Fishwick, op. cit. (above n. 21): 171ff. and the authorities cited there.

23. For the text, see O. Rossbach, T. Livii Ab Urbe Condita Libri, reprint Stuttgart (1959): 120f. This, of course, is not to say that Suetonius himself never committed chronological blunders in the early chapters of his life of Claudius. Cf. Claud. 1. 2 where the elder Drusus is said to have been "in quaesturae praeturaeque honore dux Raetici, deinde Germanici belli ...." Drusus, however, most probably held the

quaestorship in 18 B.C. before the Rhaetian campaign which began in 15 B.C. (From a comparison of the phrase "in quaesturae praeturaeque honore" with examples of similar phrases to be found elsewhere in Suetonius [Iul. 20. 1; Aug. 4. 1; Tib. 32. 1; Nero 4] I conclude that it must refer to the actual term of office. It may not refer to Drusus' status qua ex quaestor or ex praetor. For the dispensation Drusus received to hold the office of quaestor five years in advance of the legal minimum age see the sources collected in Stein, PIR^2: 196, though see R. Seager, Tiberius, London [1972]: 23. Suetonius also states that Drusus "ac post praeturam confestim inito consulatu ... obiit" [Claud. 1. 3]. Since Drusus was consul in 9 B.C. and urban praetor in 11 B.C. this statement is hard to understand, for "confestim" cannot mean two years.) Since, however, Drusus was not the major topic of the present biography, such chronological inaccuracies do not, as in Livy's case, make the chronology of Suetonius' early chapters as a whole suspect. Claudius is the principal subject of Claud. 2. 1 and, therefore, it may be assumed that Suetonius was more rigorous in his description of Claudius' birth.

24. For these coins see H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, Vol. 1, Augustus to Vitellius, London (1965): cxii, 548ff.; A.S. Robertson, Roman Imperial Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet, University of Glasgow, Vol. 1, University of Glasgow, Oxford (1962) xxxi; Wells, op. cit. (above n. 16): 267; Audin and Quoniam, op. cit. (above n. 5): 108f.; Deininger, op. cit. (above n. 5): 100, n. 2.

25. See below Chapter 2, p. 23ff.

26. See above n. 24 and M. Grant, Roman Imperial Money, London (1954): 76f. For the initiative taken by Claudius in issuing the Altar series at Lyon, see also V.M. Scramuzza, The Emperor Claudius, Cambridge, Mass., (1940): 158.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

* An earlier version of this chapter was read at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in June 1976. It has since received publication, with the same title, in *JRS* 67 (1977): 91-94.

1. *CIL* I^2: 318.
2. *PIR*^{2}: 93. Cf. A. Degrassi, *I Fasti Consolari dell'Impero Romano*, Rome (1952): 5 where the date of the consulate of L. Caninius Gallus is evidently based on the accepted date for the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor in 2 B.C.
3. *Res Gestae* 22. 2 (see below p. 25).
4. Cf. Dio 55. 10, *id*. 60. 5. 3. See also Regner, *RE Supplb*. 7: 1643-1644 and above n. 3.
5. Dio 60. 5. 3: "ἐν γὰρ δὴ τῇ τοῦ Αὐγούστου νουμηνίᾳ, ἠγωνίζοντο μὲν ἵπποι, ... ὁ τοῦ Ἄρεως ναὸς ἐν ταύτῃ καθιέρωτο καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐτησίοις ἀγῶσιν ἐτετίμητο."

6. *Feriale Cumanum*: *CIL* I^2: 229; *Fasti Maffeiani*: *CIL* I^2: 224; Philocalus: *CIL* I^2: 263. These sources are collected, conveniently enough, in V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*^{2}, Oxford (1955): 48. *Cum*.: "[*eo dies aedes Martis dedicast. supplica]tio Molibus Martis*"; *Maf*.: "*lud. Mart. in circ*."; Phil. "*Martialici*." For the *Feriale Duranum*, see R.O. Fink, A.S. Hoey, and W.F. Snyder, The *Feriale Duranum*, *YCS* 7 (1940): 120ff.: "*iiii idus maias ob circenses ma[rtiales] marti pa[tri ult]ori ta[u]rum*"; also *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report V*, Part I: *The Parchments and Papyri* (1959): 199.

7. See especially *Fasti* 5. 550-552 (below p. 26.

8. Dio 54. 8. 3, " ἀμέλει καὶ θυσίας ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ νεων Ἄρεως Τιμωροῦ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ, κατὰ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Φερετρίου ζήλωμα, πρὸς τὴν τῶν σημείων ἀνάθεσιν

καὶ ψηφισθῆναι ἐκέλευσε καὶ ἐποίησε." See Mommsen, *loc. cit*. (above n. 1).

9. See, for example, H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, Vol. 1, *Augustus to Vitellius*, London (1965): 58, 65f., 114.

10. Cf., for example, Marbach, *RE* 14: 1924f.

11. Cf., for example, A. Degrassi, *I. Ital*. 13. 2: 456f, 490; Marbach, *loc. cit*. (above n. 10); H. Heinen, Zur Begründung des römischen Kaiserkultes, von 48 v. Chr. bis 14 n. Chr., *Klio* 11 (1911): 139, 169 n. 1; S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient* Rome, London (1927): 329f.; Fink, *et al*., *loc. cit*. (above n. 6); U.W. Scholz, *Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen* Marskult und Marsmythos, Heidelberg (1970): 23; P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum. Das Bildprogramm*, Monumenta Artis Romanae 2, Tübingen (1968): 22ff.; V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, Teil II, Band 2, Leipzig (1896), reprint Stuttgart (1964):

476f. Gardthausen suggested that the games produced on 12 May commemorated the actual return to Rome of the lost *signa*. Cf. T.D. Barnes, The Victories of Augustus, *JRS* 64 (1974): 21.

12. Ehrenberg and Jones, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 20.

13. Having accepted Mommsen's suggestion, two of the most authoritative writers on Roman religion have decided that Ovid was indeed confused. See G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* ², Munich (1912): 146, n. 8, and K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft Abt. 5, Teil 4, Munich (1960): 302, n. 7. Cf. J.G. Frazer, *Ovid's Fasti*, London (1931): 300; G.B. Pighi, Le "dee invitte" del tempio Marte Ultore, *Att. Acad. Sc. Ist. Bologna* 59 (1970-71): 39ff., especially 45, n. 10.

14. *I. Ital*. 13. 2: 490, "*Miramur nec dedicationem templi nec ludos in ullis fastis adnotata esse*."

15. Cf., for example, H. Mattingly and E.A. Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, Vol. 1, *Augustus to Vitellius*, London (1923): 46; Platner and Ashby, *loc. cit*. (above n. 11).

16. For the date of this poem, see C. Franke, *Fasti Horatiani*, (1839: 223ff. cited by E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford (1957): 449, n. 1. Cf. also Hor. *Car*. 3. 5 and Propertius 3. 4. 6, "*assuescunt Latio Partha tropaea Iovi*."

17. For example, Mattingly, *op. cit*. (above n. 9): cxi.

18. The dedication took place at a later date, Dio 54. 8. 4. The words used by Dio (54. 8. 3) suggest the formal decision taken to build a temple. Cf., for example, *Mon. Ancyr*. 12. 2

19. M.H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Vol. 1, Oxford (1974): 495; Vol. 2: Pl. LVII, 480.

20. S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, Oxford (1971): 241ff. Cf. *JRS* 51 (1961): 215.

21. Crawford, *op. cit*. (above n. 19), Vol. 2, 744 and Pl. LXIV, 540.

22. Ehrenberg and Jones, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 50.

23. Cf., for example, the case of the altar "*Fortunae Reduci*" whose constitution is recorded in the *Fasti Amiternini*: *CIL* I^{2}: 245. See. K. Hanell, Das Opfer des Augustus an der Ara Pacis, *Opuscula Romana* 2 (1960): 65f. where it is argued that the date of constitution was the more important anniversary; cf. D. Fishwick, Templum Divo Claudio Constitutum, *Britannia* 3 (1972): 176ff.

24. Th. Krauss in *Festschrift Eugen v. Mercklin*, ed. E. von Homann-Wedeking and B. Segall, Waldassen (1964): 66ff. showed that the figure of Mars represented on the coins of *circa* 19 B.C. should not be understood "*als Abbild einer wirklichen Statue*" but "*nur als Marsdarstellung*" (p. 71) and that there is no numismatic evidence for a cult statue of Mars Ultor associated

with any temple prior to the dedication of the temple in the Forum of Augustus. Also, there is the slight possibility that Dio's statement (54. 8. 3) reflects the formal constitution of that temple dedicated in 2 B.C. See above n. 18 and Fishwick, op. cit. (above n. 23): 177, n. 81. Macrobius 2. 4. 9: "Cum multi Severo Cassio accusante absolverentur, et architectus fori Augusti expectationem operis diu traheret, ita iocatus est: vellem Cassius et meum forum accuset."

25. At least one other attempt has been made to remove the aedicula of Mars Ultor from the Capitol. H.R.W. Smith, Problems, Historical and Numismatic, in the Reign of Augustus, University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology 2, 4, Berkeley (1951): 194ff. suggested that Dio misunderstood the evidence supplied by the calendars and by the coinage. This suggestion, though favored by Volkman, Gnomon 24 (1952): 361, was not thought

to be convincing by Grant, *CR* n.s. 5 (1955): 187, or by Weinstock, *JRS* 51 (1961): 215. There is, on the other hand, no evidence to show that Dio himself believed that there was a temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus. Dio 55. 10 is taken from the index to 55. 1. 7 and may well represent the knowledge of the compiler of the index. Perhaps the temple of Iuppiter which Dio confused with that of Mars Ultor was the temple erected a short while earlier to Iuppiter Tonans.

26. Dio 60. 5. 4: "ἔν τε οὖν τούτοις ἐμετρίαζε."

27. Cf. Mommsen, *CIL* I: 302f.; Fink, *et al*., *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 124; Weinstock (1971): 210f.

28. Cf. Suet. *Claud*. 11. 2. For Gaius' celebration of the birthdays of Tiberius and Drusilla, see Dio 59. 24. 7.

29. W. Henzen, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*, Berlin (1874): 57.

30. Dio 60. 5. 1.

31. If the suggestion made in this chapter is

accepted, namely that the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated in the Forum of Augustus on 12 May 2 B.C., we are surely presented with a much clearer context for the dedication of the column in the *Forum Traiani*--perhaps to this same deity on 12 May; cf. Fink, *et al*., *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 123, nn. 508-512.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. For the personal or political advantages to be gained from changes or inversions in nomenclature, see R. Syme, Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature, *Historia* 7 (1958): 172-188, especially 173f.

2. See above n. 1, Syme (1958): 185f.

3. E. Stein, *RE* 3: 2705. For the ancient sources see E. Stein, *PIR*^{2} II: 857.

4. Cf. Q. Scaevola, *Lib. inc. auct. de praenominibus*, ed. Kempf (1888): 589 "*pueris non prius quam togam virilem ... praenomina imponi moris fuisse Q. Scaevola auctor est*"; Th. Mommsen, Die römische Eigennamen der republikanischen und augusteischen Zeit, *Römische Forschungen* I, Berlin (1864): 31, n. 3; Regner, *RE* II 6: 1450.

5. For the calendars, see V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*^{2}, Oxford (1955): 54. *Feriale Cumanum*: "*natalis Ti.*

Caesaris. supplicatio Vestae."; *f. a. Antiates*: "*Aug. natal*."; *acta Arvalium*^{2} (no. 2025, cf. no. 2028): "*... [ob natalem] Ti. Caesaris divi August[i f. Augusti pontificis maximi] tribunic. potestate XXXV[II] ...*" See also Suet. *Tib*. 5. 1, "*... sed ut plures certioresque tradunt*, *natus est Romae in Palatio XVI. Kal. Dec. M. Aemilio Lepido iterum L. Munatio Planco conss. per bellum Philippense*."

6. For Drusus see Tac. *Ann*. 3. 39, "*Per idem tempus Neronem e liberis Germanici iam ingressum iuventam commendavit patribus*, *utque munere capessendi vigintiviratus solveretur et quinquennio maturius quam per leges quaesturam peteret non sine inrisu audientium postulavit. praetendebat sibi atque fratri decreta eadem petente Augusto*." See also Dio 54. 10. 4. For Tiberius, see above Tacitus, *loc. cit*.; Dio 53. 28. 3; R. Seager, *Tiberius*, London (1972): 15; B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, London (1976): 32, n. 6.

For a discussion of the chronological problems raised by Suet. *Claud*. 1. 2, "*is Drusus in quaesturae praeturaeque honore dux Raetici, deinde Germanici belli ...*" see above, Chapter 1, n. 23.

7. For Tiberius' assumption of the *toga virilis*, see Ehrenberg and Jones, *op. cit*. (above n. 5): 48. *f. a. Praenestini* (24 April): "*Ti. Caesar togam virilem sumpsit imp. Caesare VIII M. Agrippa III cos*."

8. Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch*. I: 16, n. 18.

9. Münzer, *RE* 3: 2774.

10. *CIL* I 857: ΣΕΞΣΤΟΣ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΣ ΔΕΚΟΜΟΥ ΛΙΒΕΡΤΙΝΟΣ ΑΝΤΙ ΔΙΟΝ ΤΕΡΤΙΟΝ ΝΩΝΑΙΣ ... . This inscription constitutes the only evidence used by Mommsen in support of his sweeping statement that Decimus was a well-used *praenomen* of the *Claudii Nerones*. There is, however, no indication in this inscription to justify that assertion.

11. The circumstances surrounding the marriage of Livia Drusilla to Octavian and the

birth of the elder Drusus are certainly shrouded in mystery. Suetonius like Tacitus (Ann. 1. 10, 5. 1) and Dio (48. 44; cf. Vell. Pat. 2. 95. 1; Porphyr. ad Hor. Car. 4. 4. 27-28) asserts that Livia was pregnant when she entered Octavian's household (cf. Suet. Aug. 62. 2, id. Tib. 4. 3). Suetonius also states that the elder Drusus had the same birthdate as the Triumvir M. Antonius, i.e. 14 January (Ehrenberg and Jones, op. cit. [above n. 5]: 45). However, the wedding of Octavian and Livia appears to have taken place on 17 January (Ehrenberg and Jones, op. cit.[above n. 5]: 46). Thus, the birth of the elder Drusus must have occurred--on the basis of the epigraphic evidence--only a few days before the marriage ceremony, and not, as most other sources state, after the wedding (cf. Aur. Vict. 1. 26). It is also stated by Suetonius (Aug. 62. 2) that Octavian "Liviam Drusillam matrimonio Tiberi Neronis ...

abduxit" immediately after his divorce from Scribonia. According to Dio (48. 4. 3) this divorce took place in 39 B.C. Thus, it is possible that Livia, prior to the formal marriage ceremony, cohabited with Octavian after she had been betrothed to him (so J. Carcopino, Précisions chronologiques relatives au mariage d'Octave et de Livie, *BSAF* [8 May 1929]: 147-148' *id*. Le Mariage d'Octave et de Livie et la Naissance de Drusus, *Rev. Hist*. 161 [1929]: 225-236). This suggestion has the merit of explaining the "*suspicio*" of adultery and, not least, of reconciling the sources. The witticism " τοῖς εὐτυχοῦσι καὶ τρίμηνα παιδία " (cf. Dio 48. 44. 5) would then refer to this period of cohabitation rather than to the period following the marriage ceremony. The problem may never be resolved, cf. Stein, *PIR*^{2} II: 196. Perhaps the suggestion made by G.V. Sumner, Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, *Latomus* 26 (1967):424-425, n. 1, offers the best hope for a solution. Clearly, if Dio is right (60. 2. 1) in assigning Claudius' celebration of his father's birthday to the year of his accession, A.D. 41, the elder Drusus must have been born after 25 January. In this case, Drusus' "*dies natalis*" cannot have been the same as that of the Triumvir M. Antonius, with the result that Suetonius (*Claud*. 11. 3) has misrepresented Claudius' actual statement : "*ne Marcum quidem Antonium inhonoratum ac sine grata mentione transmisit, testatus quondam per edictum, tanto impensius petere se ut natalem patris Drusi celebrarent, quod idem esset et avi sui Antoni[i]*."

12. For the unhappy fortunes of the elder Drusus' father, Ti. Claudius Nero, see, briefly, Seager, *op. cit*. (above n. 6): 9ff.; Tac. *Ann*. 5. 1; Suet. *Tib*. 4. 3; Vell. Pat. 2. 79. 2. See also above n. 11.

13. Münzer, *RE* 13: 881ff.; Suet. *Tib*. 3. 1f.; Dio 48. 44. 1; Vell. Pat. 2. 94. 1;

T.R.S. Broughton, The Magistrates of the Roman Republic, Vol. II, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 15, 2, Cleveland (1952): 248.

14. Cf. Broughton, op. cit. (above n. 13): 524ff.

15. Cf. especially, H. Peterson, The Numeral Praenomina of the Romans, TAPA 93 (1962): 347-354, especially 350ff.

16. For Augustus' guardianship of the brothers, see Horace Car. 4. 4. 27-28 (below p. 40); cf. Consol. ad Liv. 209; Dio 48. 44. 5.

17. This poem was written in honor of the elder Drusus' Alpine victories and, therefore, was composed no earlier than 15-14 B.C. For the use of the name Nero, see especially E. Fraenkel, Horace, Oxford (1957): 427. "Monte decurrens velut amnis, the beginning of the ode rolls along in a mighty period of full twenty-eight lines until at last it comes to a stop with the momentous name of Nerones."

18. The elder Drusus' name before his death

was Nero Claudius Drusus. For this name, and the inversion Drusus Claudius Nero, see Stein, PIR^2, loc. cit. Another possible context for Drusus' change in nomenclature has been proposed very recently by Levick, op. cit. (above n. 6): 19. Levick argues that, after the return of Tiberius' family to Italy, "Tiberius became the heir of a man (evidently childless) called M. Gallius; along with the property he was to accept the name of his benefactor, leaving his brother to preserve that of the Nerones." For several reasons, however, this argument lacks cogency. Firstly, according to Levick's suggestion (see also 232, n. 2), the testamentary adoption must have taken place after Drusus' birth and, therefore, at the earliest, after Tiberius Claudius Nero's divorce from Livia Drusilla, which occurred probably in late 39 B.C. (see above n. 11). Since, however, Levick accepts the record of our sources that

Festschrift für Eugen von Mercklin, Waldassen (1964): 66-75

Kroll, W., Iulius (138), *RE* 10 (1917): 435-464

Kühner, R., and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Teil 2, Bde. 1-2, Hannover/Leipzig (1898-1904)

Lacey, W.K., Nominatio and the elections under Tiberius, *Historia* 12 (1963): 167-176

Lambrechts, P., César dans l'historiographie contemporaine, *AC* 23 (1954): 126-143

Latte, K., *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. 5, Teil 4, Munich (1960)

Leibenam, W., Comitia, *RE* 4 (1900): 679-715

Lesuisse, L., Le titre de Caesar et son évolution au cours de l'histoire de l'empire, *LEC* 29 (1961): 271-287

-------, L'aspect héréditaire de la succession impériale sous les Julio-Claudiens, *LEC* 30 (1962): 32-50

Levi, M.A., La Tabula Hebana e il valore storico, *PP* 14 (1950): 158-170

Levick, B.M., Drusus Caesar and the adoptions of A.D. 4, *Latomus* 25 (1966): 227-244

-------, Imperial control of the elections under the early Principate: Commendatio, Suffragatio, and "Nominatio", Historia 16 (1967): 207-230

-------, The fall of Julia the Younger, Latomus 35 (1976): 301-339

-------, Tiberius the Politician, London (1976)

Linnert, U., Beiträge zur Geschichte Caligulas, Diss. Jena (1908)

Macé, A., Essai sur Suétone, Paris (1900)

Marbach, E., Mars, RE 14 (1930): 1919-1937

Mattingly, H., eds. A. Sydenham and C.H.V. Sutherland, The Roman Imperial Coinage, Vol. 1, Augustus to Vitellius, London (1923)

-------, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, Vol. 1, Augustus to Vitellius, London (1965)

Meise, E., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Julisch-Claudischen Dynastie, Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, 10, Munich (1969)

Millar, F., A Study of Cassius Dio, Oxford (1964)

-------, The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337), London (1977)

Momigliano, A., Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone, RAL 8 (1932): 305-307

-------, Claudius, the Emperor and his Achievement 2, trans. G.W.B. Hogarth, Cambridge (1962)

Mommsen, Th., Epigraphische Analekten, Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 14 November Öffentliche Sitzung, 2 (1850): 287-326

-------, Römische Forschungen, 1, Berlin (1864)

-------, Die Familie des Germanicus, Hermes 13 (1878): 245-265

-------, Römische Staatsrecht 3, Bde. 1-3, Lepizig (1887-88)

-------, Römische Strafrecht, Leipzig (1899)

-------, Gesammelte Schriften, Bde. 1-7, Berlin (1903-09)

Mouchová, B., Adoption und Testament in Suetons Kaiserbiographen. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis des Wortschatzes bei Sueton, Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Phil. et Hist., 5, *Graecolatina* 3 (1966): 55-63

-------, *Studie zu Kaiserbiographien Suetons*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Phil. et Hist., Monographia 22, Prague (1968)

Mullens, H.G., The women of the Caesars, *Greece and Rome* 11 (1941-42): 59-67

Münzer, F., Claudii Nerones, *RE* 3 (1899): 2773-2774

-------, Livius Drusus (19), *RE* 13 (1926): 881-884

Nesselhauf, H., Die neue Germanicus-Inschrift von Magliano, *Historia* 1 (1950): 105-115

Niemeyer, H.G., *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser*, Monumenta Artis Romanae, 7, Berlin (1968)

Nierhaus, R., *Das swebische Gräberfeld von Diersheim. Studien zur Geschichte der Germanen am Oberrhein vom Gallischen Krieg bis zur alamannischen Landnahme*, Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 28 (1966) [non vidi]

Nock, A.D., Notes on the ruler cult, I-IV, *JHS* 48 (1928): 38-43

-------, Σύνναος θεός, *HThR* 41 (1948): 1-62

O'Brien Moore, A, Senatus, *RE* Supplb. 6 (1935): 660-800

Oliver. J.H., and R.E.A. Palmer, Text of the Tabula Hebana, *AJP* 75 (1954): 225-249

dell'Oro, A., Rogatio e riforma dei comizi centuriati, *PP* 14 (1950): 132-150

d'Ors, A., Tabula Ilicitana, *Iura* 1 (1950): 280-282

Paladini, M.L., Le votazioni del Senato romano nell'età di Traiano, *Athenaeum* 37 (1959): 3-134

Pani, M., *Comitia e Senato. Sulla trasformazione della procedura elettorale a Roma nell'età di Tiberio*, Bari (1974)

Pappano, A.E., Agrippa Postumus, *CP* 36 (1941): 30-45

Pelletier, A., *Legatio ad Gaium*, Les Oevres de Philon d'Alexandrie, Paris (1972)

Peterson, H., The numeral Praenomina of the Romans, *TAPA* 93 (1962): 347-354

Phillips, E.J., The emperor Gaius' abortive invasion of Britain, *Historia* 19 (1970): 369-374

Pighi, G.B., Le "dee invitte" del tempio Marte Ultore, *Att. Acad. Sc. Ist. Bologna, Rendiconti* 59 (1970-71): 39-46

Pippidi, D.M., La date de l'*Ara Numinis Augusti* de Rome, REL 11 (1933): 435-456

-------, Recherches sur le culte impériale, Romanian Institute of Latin Studies, Bucarest/Paris (1939)

Platner, S.B., and T. Ashby, A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, London (1927)

Prévost, M.H., Les Adoptions politiques à Rome, Publications de l'Institut de Droit Romain de l'Université de Paris, 5, Paris (1949)

Regner, J., Tirocinium Fori, RE II, 6 (1936): 1450-1453

-------, Nachträge: Ludi circenses, RE Supplb. 7 (1940): 1626-1664

Ritterling, E., Legio, RE 12 (1924-25) 1211-1829

Robert, L., Le culte de Caligula à Milet et la province d'Asie, Hellenica 7 (1949): 206-238

Robertson, A.S., Roman Imperial Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet, University of Glasgow, Vol. 1, University of Glasgow/Oxford (1962)

Rolfe, J.C., Suetonius, Vols. 1-2, London (1914)

Rossbach, O., T. Livii Ab Urbe Condita Libri, reprint Stuttgart (1959)

Rotundi, G., Leges Publicae Populi Romani, Milan (1912) de Ruggiero, E., Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità romane, Rome (1895-)

Schmid, W., Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus, Bde. 1-4, Stuttgart (1887), reprint Hildesheim (1964)

Schmitt, H.H., Der pannonische Aufstand d. J. 14 und der Regierungsantritt des Tiberius, Historia 7 (1958): 378-383

Scholz, U.W., Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen Marskult und Marsmythos, Heidelberg (1970)

Schönberger, H., The Roman frontier in Germany. An archaeological survey, JRS 59 (1969): 144-197

Schwyzer, E., and A. Debrunner, Griechische Grammatik, Bd. 2, Syntax und syntactische Stylistik, Munich (1950)

Scott, K., The significance of statues in precious metals in emperor worship, TAPA 52 (1931): 101-123

Scramuzza, V.M., The Emperor Claudius, Cambridge, Mass., (1940)

Scullard, H.H., From the Gracchi to Nero ^{4}, London (1976)

Seager, R., Tiberius, London (1972)

Sealey, R., The political attachments of L. Aelius Seianus, Phoenix 15 (1961): 97-114

Seston, W., Germanicus héros fondateur, PP 14 (1950): 171-184

Shotter, D.C.A., Elections under Tiberius, CQ n.s. 60 (1966): 321-332

Siber, H., Die Wahlreform des Tiberius, Festschrift für Paul Koschaker, Weimar (1939): 171-217

-------, Römische Verfassungsrecht in geschichtlicher Entwicklung, Lahr (1952)

Smallwood, E.M., The chronology of Gaius' attempt to desecrate the temple, Latomus 16 (1957): 3-17

-------, Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium, Leiden (1961)

-------, Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero, Cambridge (1967)

Smilda, H., C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii, Diss. Gröningen (1896)

Smith, H.R.W., Problems, historical and numismatic, in the reign of Augustus, University of

California Publications in Classical Archaeology, 2, 4 Berkeley (1951): 133-230

Staveley, E.S., Greek and Roman Voting and Elections, London (1972)

-------, review of PANI, JRS 65 (1975): 201

Steidle, W., Sueton und die antike Biographie, Zetemata, 1, Munich (1963)

Stein, A., Cornelius (220), RE 4 (1900): 1384-1386

Stewart, Z., Sejanus, Gaetulicus, and Seneca, AJP 74 (1953): 70-85

Stuart, M., The date of the inscription of Claudius on the Arch of Ticinum, AJA 40 (1936): 314-322

Sumner, G.V., Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, Latomus 26 (1967): 413-435

Syme, R., Imperator Caesar: A study in nomenclature, Historia 7 (1958): 172-188

-------, Tacitus, Vols 1-2, Oxford (1958)

Taeger, F., Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes, Bde. 1-2, Stuttgart (1960)

Taylor, L.R., The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, 1, Middletown (1931)

-------, Tiberius' *Ovatio* and the *Ara Numinis Augusti*, *AJP* 58 (1937): 185-193

-------, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, Ann Arbor (1966)

Tibiletti, G., Il funzionamento dei comizi centuriati alla luce della Tavola Hebana, *Athenaeum* 27 (1949): 210-245

-------, *Principe e magistrati repubblicani. Ricerca di storia augustea e tiberiana*, Rome (1953)

Timpe, D., *Untersuchungen zur Kontinuität des frühen Prinzipats*, Historia-Einzelschriften, 5, Wiesbaden (1962)

Townend, G.B., The date of composition of Suetonius' Caesares, *CQ* 9 (1959): 285-293

-------, The sources of Greek in Suetonius, *Hermes* 88 (1960): 98-120

-------, Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius, and Pliny, *Hermes* 89 (1961): 227-248

-------, Suetonius and his influence, in T.A. Dorey ed., *Latin Biography*, London (1967): 79-111 de Visscher, F., and F. della Corte, C. Gatti, M.A. Levi, Tabula Hebana, *PP* 14 (1950): 98-107

-------, La destinatio, *PP* 14 (1950): 118-131

-------, Tacite et les réformes éléctorales d'Auguste et de Tibere, *Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz*, Vol. 2, Naples (1953): 428

Vivell, K., *Chronologisch-kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Claudius*, Diss. Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Heidelberg i. B. (1911)

Volkmann, H., review of SMITH, *Gnomon* 24 (1952): 360-362

Wall, J.L., *Prolegomena to the Study of the Manuscripts of Suetonius, and a Critical Edition of the Lives of Nero and Claudius*, Diss. London (1968)

Ward, M.M., The association of Augustus with Jupiter, *SMSR* 9 (1933): 203-224

Watson, G.R., *The Roman Soldier*, London (1969)

Webster, G., *The Roman Imperial Army*, London (1969)

Weinstock, S., review of LATTE, *JRS* 51 (1961): 206-215

-------, Divus Julius, Oxford (1971)

Welles, C. Bradford, R.O. Fink, and J.F. Gilliam, The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report V, Part I: The Parchments and Papyri, New Haven (1959)

Wellesley, K., The dies imperii of Tiberius, JRS 57 (1967): 23-30

Wells, C.M., The German Policy of Augustus. An Examination of the Archaeological Evidence, Oxford (1972)

Willrich, H., Caligula, Klio 3 (1903): 85-118; 288-317; 397-470

Wissowa, G., Religion und Kultus der Römer ^{2}, Munich (1912)

Woodman, A.J., Velleius Paterculus. The Tiberian Narrative (2.94-131), Cambridge (1977)

Zanker, P., Forum Augustum. Das Bildprogramm, Monumenta Artis Romanae, 2, Tübingen (1968)

APPENDIX

The Early Name of Germanicus

There is extant today no ancient evidence for the name borne by Germanicus before his entry into the Julian household in A.D. 4 as the adoptive son of the future emperor Tiberius. This problem has been exacerbated because today two quite different names have been attributed to Germanicus during this period from his birth in 15 B.C. [1] Nero Claudius Drusus is conjectured because Germanicus was the elder son of that Drusus who died in 9 B.C.; as the elder son, it is suggested, he naturally received his father's name. [2] The other, Tiberius Claudius Nero, has been given to Germanicus without any scholarly argument to support it. [3] Most scholars, however, appear to have avoided the problem and, throughout their work, have used only Germanicus' popular name. [4]

The first name, then, Nero Claudius Drusus, is based on the assumption that the eldest son in a Roman family of this period would naturally assume his father's name. Such an assumption, however, cannot be taken for granted; for the son born to Germanicus' uncle Tiberius in 14 B.C. was named not Tiberius Claudius Nero, which was his father's name, but Nero Claudius Drusus. [5] Of course, there is the possibility that this man was not the eldest son born to Tiberius, since Tiberius may have been married to Vipsania for at least five years. Such a possibility, however, is remote and contradicts the evidence of Suetonius (_Tib_. 7. 2). [6] Moreover, the name Nero Claudius Drusus was still at this time an unusual name. Unusual, that is, because the only person to bear this name (apart from Germanicus ?) before 14 B.C. was the elder Drusus and, more significantly, because it involved a peculiar inversion to _praenomen_ of the time honored _cognomen_ Nero.

If indeed Nero Claudius Drusus was the name given to Tiberius' son in 14 B.C., there can be no doubt that (a) Tiberius either was unaware of, or ignored, the hereditary rule mentioned above (p. 43) and (b) that he named his son in honor of, and out of affection for, his brother.

Given, therefore, the very strong possibility that Tiberius named his son after his brother and given the fact that Tiberius and the elder Drusus were closely associated, not only on the field of battle--the Alpine campaigns--but also in their affection for one another,[7] we are surely compelled to accept the probability that in 15 B.C. the elder Drusus named his son after his brother, Tiberius Claudius Nero. In any case, at this time before the tortuous expansion of the Augustan family, there is no evidence to suggest that a situation would have been tolerated in which two children born no more than about seventeen months apart to such closely affiliated brothers would have been given identical names. If we accept, therefore, the current belief that Tiberius' son was named Nero Claudius Drusus, I believe we must also accept that, before his entry into the Julian house in A.D. 4, Germanicus was named Tiberius Claudius Nero.

NOTES TO APPENDIX

1. For this date, see G.V. Sumner, Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, Latomus 26 (1967): 413-427 contra B.M. Levick, Drusus Caesar and the Adoptions of A.D. 4, Latomus 25 (1966): 227-244. See also B. Levick, Tiberius the Politician, London (1976): 240, n. 7 (cf. 319, ad nom.).

2. For this hereditary rule, and the name, see Th. Mommsen, Die Familie des Germanicus, Hermes 13 (1878): 262f., n. 3; Stein, RE 7 1251; Stein and Petersen, PIR^2: 221; Momigliano and Cadoux, OCD^2: 465; P. Kneissl, Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser, Hypomnemata 23, Gottingen (1969): 30-32; H.H. Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero^4, London (1976): 485; Kroll, RE 10: 435.

3. See, for example, Groag, RE 3: 2782; A. Momigliano, Claudius, The Emperor and His Achievement^2, trans. G.W.B. Hogarth, Cambridge (1962): 80, n. 2; Charlesworth,

CAH 10 (1934): 1013.

4. It would be tedious and quite pointless to catalogue the names of all these scholars. Cf., for example, K. Christ, *Drusus und Germanicus. Der Eintritt der Römer in Germanien*, Paderborn (1956).

5. See Sumner, *loc. cit*. (above n. 1); cf. Levick (1976): 30, 236, n. 62. See also Stein and Petersen, *PIR*^{2}: 219 for the evidence for the name Nero Claudius Drusus.

6. Suet. *Tib*. 7. 2, "*Agrippinam, Marco Agrippa genitam, neptem Caecili Attici equitis R., ad quem sunt Ciceronis epistulae, duxit uxorem; sublato ex ea filio Druso, quanquam bene convenientem rursusque gravidam dimittere ac Iuliam Augusti filiam confestim coactus est ducere non sine magno angore animi, cum et Agrippinae consuetudine teneretur et Iuliae mores improbaret ....*"
See, for example, R. Seager, *Tiberius*, London (1972): 14.

7. And in Augustus' eyes; cf. Tac. Ann. 1. 3. 1.

VITA

NAME: Christopher John Simpson

BIRTHPLACE: Sunderland, England

YEAR OF BIRTH 1946

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND DEGREES

University of Nottingham

1966-1969 B.A.

University of Nottingham

1969-1971 M.Phil.

Dissertation: *Foederati and Laeti in Late Roman Frontier Defence*

University of Alberta

1971 continuing

PUBLICATIONS

(1) "Where was *Senonae* ? A problem of geography in Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI, 3, 3," *Latomus* 33 (1974): 940-942

(2) "Claudian and the federation of the Bastarnae," *Latomus* 34 (1975): 221-223

(3) "Belt buckles and strap ends of the later Roman empire: A preliminary survey of several new groups," Britannia 7 (1976): 192-223

(4) "A late Roman belt buckle from Corbridge, Northumberland," Britannia 7 (1976):285-286

(5) "*Laeti* in northern Gaul: A note on *Pan. Lat.* VIII, 21," Latomus 36 (1977): 169-170

(6) "Julian and the *laeti*: A note on Ammianus Marcellinus, XX, 8, 13," Latomus 36 (1977): 519-521

(7) "The date of dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor," JRS 67 (1977): 91-94

(8) "The 'conspiracy' of A.D. 39," Collection Latomus, in press

(9) Review of P. De Jonge, Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XVII, Groningen (1977) for Phoenix 32 (1978), in press